


THE
FOURFOLD GOSPEL,
SECTION 4
THE LAW OF THE NEW KINGDOM
(1916)



EDWIN ABBOTT ABBOTT

KESSINGER LEGACY REPRINTS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

The Fourfold Gospel, Section 4: The Law Of The New Kingdom

Edwin Abbott Abbott

In the interest of creating a more extensive selection of rare historical book reprints, we have chosen to reproduce this title even though it may possibly have occasional imperfections such as missing and blurred pages, missing text, poor pictures, markings, dark backgrounds and other reproduction issues beyond our control. Because this work is culturally important, we have made it available as a part of our commitment to protecting, preserving and promoting the world's literature. Thank you for your understanding.

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL

SECTION IV

THE LAW OF THE NEW KINGDOM

BY

EDWIN A. ABBOTT

Honorary Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge

Fellow of the British Academy

"Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ."

The Epistle to the Galatians, vi. 2.

Cambridge :
at the University Press

1916



Cambridge:

**PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS**

PREFACE

THE subject with which this volume begins is Christ's teaching in parables and His object in thus teaching. The subject with which it concludes (or draws towards its conclusion) is Christ's precept to His typical follower: "Let him deny himself and take up his cross." There are few Synoptic traditions that are more obscure as to their meaning and origin than these two. An attempt will be made in the following pages to shew that the Fourth Evangelist, who nowhere mentions the word "parable," and who nowhere represents Jesus as mentioning the word "cross," constantly refers to Christian thoughts about both these terms, and helps us not only to understand why he, the writer, left the terms unmentioned, but also to draw nearer to what we may believe to have been thought about them by our Lord Himself.

Mark's Gospel is taken as the starting point for investigation, for three reasons, first, because it has been proved to contain Synoptic tradition in its earliest form, secondly, because Matthew and Luke have largely borrowed from it, and thirdly, for a reason that cannot be quite so briefly expressed.

It is, that Mark appears to have been, to a surprising extent, let alone by early editors and scribes. Victor of Antioch, writing not earlier than the fifth century, complains that Mark's is the only Gospel on which he has not been able to find a single continuous commentary. The result is that Mark often retains, in a brief, rough, and obscure shape, some tradition, altered or omitted in Matthew, and

PREFACE

still more frequently in Luke, which takes us back, closer than we are taken by their later and smoother traditions, to the original thought.

In these cases, where the thought is of importance, John often intervenes in such a way that he explains Mark's tradition. The instances of intervention are so frequent that it has been found expedient to regard such Johannine intervention as a rule, and to undertake the task of discussing all important exceptions.

This has added greatly to the bulk of the work, and must add not a little to the labour of the reader. But it seemed the only fair course. To select some twenty or thirty instances where John obviously intervenes in behalf of Mark would have been easy, brief, and momentarily effective. But it would have left the thoughtful reader unsatisfied and inquiring—after he had had time to reflect—"But what about those instances of peculiar Marcan tradition where John has not intervened?"

By the inclusive method adopted in these pages that question is anticipated and answered. The answer is "The instances of peculiar Marcan tradition are all given. Sometimes it is admitted—as, for example, in traditions relating to the Baptist—that John has not intervened. Sometimes you may think that non-intervention ought to have been admitted more freely as to other matters. Sometimes the evidence for intervention may appear to you thin, tedious, and unsatisfactory. But in any case you cannot complain that anything is kept back. The phenomena unfavourable to the theory of Johannine Intervention are to be found in the continuous text of Mark which you can compare with the texts of Matthew and Luke in parallel columns. You can judge for yourself. The facts are placed fully before you."

PREFACE

Take, as an instance, the following tradition about parables, where Matthew omits part, and Luke the whole, of a tradition in Mark:—

Mk iv. 33—4

And with many such parables spake he *the word unto them, as they were able to hear it:*

And without a parable spake he not unto them: *but privately to his own disciples he expounded all things.*

Mt. xiii. 34

All these things spake Jesus in parables unto the multitudes; and without a parable spake he nothing unto them.

Lk. om.

John substitutes the word "proverb" for "parable" when he says about the allegorical parable of the Good Shepherd "This *proverb* [i.e. *parable*] spake he unto them." He also represents Jesus as saying, on the night before the Crucifixion, "These things have I spoken unto you in *proverbs* [i.e. *parables*]; the hour cometh when I shall no longer speak unto you in *proverbs* [i.e. *parables*] but shall tell you plainly of the Father." But the substitution of a different *word* does not affect the inference that John is here intervening as to Synoptic *thought*. We shall endeavour to shew that his object was to modify, explain, and place in its right order, the Marcan tradition omitted partially by Matthew and wholly by Luke.

It will be maintained that in the Fourth Gospel *all Christ's teaching is regarded as having been of the nature of parables, proverbs, or dark sayings, to His disciples, until the Holy Spirit was given to them after His death and resurrection.* According to this view, Mark's tradition

PREFACE

needed to be placed later. It was a mistake to suppose that Jesus used parables at any time to make His teaching obscure. The obscurity was a necessity. In that case, we may suppose John's interpretation of the motives of Jesus, and of the historical fact at the bottom of Mark's tradition, to have been something of the following kind: "All the words of the Lord Jesus before His death, not only those to the multitudes but also those to His disciples, were of the nature of parables or proverbs, which He spoke unto them '*as they were able to hear*,' in order to lead those who were willing to be led, step by step, to the truth. But after His resurrection, after He had been manifested to those of His household, the disciples, and after He had bestowed on them the Holy Spirit, from that time forward He spoke no longer in parables but told them plainly of the Father. Mark's tradition is based on fact. But he has placed it before its time. The fact became fact after the Lord had risen from the dead."

Whether this Johannine intervention is correct is a point to be discussed later on. The point for us at present is that John does appear to intervene, and that we ought not to allow his intervention as to Synoptic thought about "parables" to be concealed from us by the fact that he avoids (as he almost always does) the technical Synoptic word. It may also be added that, whether John is right or wrong, we gain something by studying the difficult Synoptic statements about Christ's parables in the light of his intervention.

Let us now consider what, if anything, John has to teach us about the second of the two subjects mentioned at the beginning of this Preface, the command that bids every Christian "take up his cross." At first sight it seems that there is nothing Johannine that even remotely

PREFACE

corresponds to this. But it has been urged in a previous part of *Diatessarica* that when Jesus said "Take my yoke upon you," that is to say, "Take my service upon you," He implied a precept that might be expressed in some circumstances (where the "service" was hard and dangerous) by the phrase "take my cross upon you." The original may not have enjoined, and probably did not enjoin, mere readiness to face death. It enjoined service to the Son of Man, including service to all the sons of man whom He came to serve and to save.

Turning to the Fourth Gospel for some command or precept of this kind—some precept enjoining service such as the Son of Man enjoined—many of my readers may be surprised to find how few commands or precepts that Gospel contains—not more than three or four—as compared with the numerous commands recorded by the Synoptists. Among these three or four by far the most prominent is that one which Jesus Himself literally fulfilled for His disciples and then bade them fulfil for one another: "If I then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought"—literally, "ye owe it as a debt"—"to wash one another's feet."

Even this precept is not expressed by an imperative. The Fourth Evangelist dislikes imperatives. Yet how much more than an ordinary imperative is implied by this "owe-it-as-a-debt" may be seen from the Johannine Epistle, which tells every Christian that "*he owes-it-as-a-debt* to walk even as he [*i.e.* Jesus] walked," and that "*we owe-it-as-a-debt* to love one another," and "Hereby know we love because he [*i.e.* Jesus] laid down his life for us, and we also *owe-it-as-a-debt* to lay down our lives for the brethren." To the same effect the Epistle to the Romans says "*Owe not a debt* to anyone except to love one another,"

PREFACE

and "We that are strong *owe-it-as-a-debt* to bear the weaknesses of those that are not strong."

It may be fairly and reasonably argued that, when John describes Jesus as thus ministering to His own disciples, who recline at the table while He waits on them like a servant, he has in view the tradition of Mark and Matthew, omitted by Luke, "Verily the Son of man came not to be ministered to, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." But, apart from this, we ought to learn much from these Johannine traditions about "*owing-as-a-debt*." They connect the "debt" of a Christian with Christ's "washing the feet" of the disciples; and with "walking" even as He walked (that is to say "following" Him); and with "loving one another"; and with "laying down life for the brethren." Is not this last phrase equivalent to "taking up the cross for the brethren"? And are we not thus brought round by these stages of tradition from the Johannine precept "wash one another's feet" to the Synoptic precept "take up the cross"—with this new light on the latter, that we perceive its meaning to be, not, "Face martyrdom, and practise asceticism that you may save your own souls," but "Follow the Son of Man whose love of men constrained Him to make Himself the Servant of those whom He loved"?

It may seem somewhat venturesome to say that Jesus was "constrained" to do anything. But in reality it is more reverent, as well as more true, than to say that He "was not constrained to do anything," or that He "could do as He pleased." The expressed doctrine of the Fourth Gospel is that Jesus "was not able to do" anything except that which He saw the Father doing. And its implied doctrine is, that the Son, being the incarnate Love of God, was constrained by His own love to take up the yoke, or

PREFACE

the cross, and to lay down His life for His brethren, to whom, when He departed from them, He bequeathed Himself, that is to say, the Spirit of His own "constraining" love.

The great need of Christendom, at the present time, is the sense, or rather the indwelling fervour, of this constraining love. The Fourth Evangelist and the Apostle of the Gentiles both speak of it as a "debt." And "debt" may seem a cold word to connect with love. So also may "constraint." But there is no coldness in the Pauline words "The love of Christ *constraineth* us: because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died; and he died for all, that those who live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again." John takes this fervid doctrine a little further by saying, in effect, that men "should no longer live unto themselves but unto the brethren for whose sake Christ died."

Thinking of this debt, as expressed by these two great exponents of Christian thought, we perceive at once that it is not of a commercial character. It may be instructively (though not completely) regarded in a military aspect, as the debt owed by the soldiers of the army of righteousness, in the first place to their Leader the Prince of righteousness—who both died for them as their comrade, and led them to victory as their Lord—and in the second place to their fellow-soldiers, whom their Leader identified with Himself. Even men of the world would admit that Christians, if they believed in the existence of such a debt, ought to regard it as "a debt of honour." Yet how very far are those who are striving to become "sons of the light" below those who frankly admit that they are "sons of this world," in feeling a whole-hearted and passionate

PREFACE

determination that, whatever else may remain unpaid, their "debt of honour" shall be discharged!

To inspire Christians with a passionate determination of this kind, passionate yet not military—merging duty in love, and "I must" in "I will"—is (doubtless) the object of all the Evangelists. But the Fourth, more than the Three, seems to reveal Jesus as the natural source of such an inspiration. The Three teach us about the Law of the Seed and about the Law of the Cross, but separately, and without much suggestion of their naturalness, or of any connection between the two. The Fourth combines the doctrines, shewing (in one and the same lesson) that the seed must fall in order to rise, and that the death implied by the Cross means self-sacrifice for others, not asceticism for oneself. The seed is drawn up by the sun from the darkness of its decaying integument into light, life, and fruitfulness; so is the crucified and buried Saviour drawn up to the Father, with power to draw up into Himself and into His eternal life the souls of those who have shared His death.

Hence it is that from the Fourth Gospel imperatives are almost banished, and commands in it are almost superseded by silent drawing. The "almost" is required by a notable exception—the last of the few Johannine imperatives, "Follow thou me." As this command was addressed to Philip at the opening of the Gospel, so it is to the penitent Peter at its close.

The exception is indeed noteworthy. But we should also note, in the same passage, an instance of silent "drawing." For there we find, besides Peter, another disciple following Jesus; and he follows uncommanded. What made him follow? We are not told. But we are led, with Johannine indirectness, to surmise the cause. "Peter,

PREFACE

turning about, seeth *the disciple whom Jesus loved* following." We must be dull indeed if we cannot infer that the cause of that "following" was Christ's "constraining love."

With the following of this unnamed disciple the following of Peter appears to be both compared and contrasted. Peter is to have the privilege of "glorifying God" by the "manner" of his "death." This probably means that he is to follow literally on the path of the Cross, and to be a crucified martyr. In any case it means that he is to be a *martyr*—that is to say, a *martus*, or "witness."

The other disciple is to have no such privilege of special following. Perhaps he is not to follow at all in any such sense but merely to wait ("If I will that he tarry?"). Tertullian said, "The blood of Christians is seed." If that were the only seed, the unnamed disciple would be no sower. But may not the life and work of Christians also be "seed"? May not this also "witness" for Christ? The Gospel implies that it may. The unnamed disciple, it says, "witnesses" in a way of his own:—"This is the disciple that *witnesseth* concerning these things, and we know that his *witness* is true."

And surely, whatever may be its historical defects, "his *witness* is true"—spiritually, most true. No other disciple of Christ, not even Paul, has so powerfully helped us to discern, in the words and deeds and posthumous influence of Jesus, the Law of the Seed and the Law of the Cross, and to recognise, beneath both, the Law of eternal Life and Growth revealed as triumphant through the transitory appearances of death.

PREFACE

I gratefully acknowledge the help of my friends Mr W. S. Aldis, Mr H. Candler, and Rev. J. Hunter Smith in revising the proofs of this volume, as also those of preceding volumes of *Diatessarica*. Their criticism has enabled me to see and to correct many obscurities, and some errors, that would otherwise have escaped my notice.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

*Wellside, Well Walk
Hampstead, N.W.*

20 Dec. 1915.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS	xxi

CHAPTER I

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

[Mark iv. 1—34]

§ 1	Christ's "parables" or "things hidden"	1
§ 2	"Hear ye," in Mark	8
§ 3	When did the disciples "ask Jesus the parables"?	10
§ 4	"The mystery of the kingdom," in Mark	15
§ 5	"The word," in Mark	19
§ 6	"The word," in John, how first mentioned by Jesus	21
§ 7	"There is nothing hid save that it should be mani- fested," in Mark	27
§ 8	"He knoweth not how," and "the earth beareth fruit of herself," in Mark	36
§ 9	"Less than all the seeds," and "greater than all the herbs," in Mark and Matthew	41
§ 10	Private "expounding," in Mark	45
§ 11	"The word," in the Fourth Gospel as a whole	49

CHAPTER II

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

[Mark iv. 35—41]

§ 1	Why does John omit this?	52
§ 2	(R.V.) "They take him with them, even as he was, in the boat," in Mark	55
§ 3	"And other boats were with him," in Mark	60
§ 4	"On the cushion," in Mark	62

CONTENTS

CHAPTER III THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

[Mark v. 1—20]

	PAGE
§ 1 Reasons for discussing this narrative	66
§ 2 "Gerasenes," "Gadarenes," or "Gergesenes"	71
§ 3 "Two" demoniacs in Matthew, and "two thousand" swine in Mark	74
§ 4 Why does Matthew omit "legion"?	75
§ 5 "Beseeching," "exhorting," or "comforting"	78
§ 6 Versions of the narrative in an Apocryphal Gospel . .	82
§ 7 "Outside the country" in Mark, and "into the abyss" in Luke	86
§ 8 "Outside," applied to the "casting out" of "the ruler" of this world," in John	89

CHAPTER IV JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

[Mark v. 21—43]

§ 1 Differences in the Synoptic narratives	94
§ 2 "Knowing that she was dead" in Luke, "Lazarus is dead" in John	100

CHAPTER V JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

[Mark vi. 1—6 a]

§ 1 The agreements and disagreements of the Four Gospels	107
§ 2 "His country" and "his own country," in all the Gospels	109
§ 3 "And his disciples follow him," in Mark	111
§ 4 "Were astonished" in Mark and Matthew, how expressed in Luke	113
§ 5 "Cast down a precipice" and "hang," confused in a version of Luke	115
§ 6 Attempts on Christ's life, in John	118
§ 7 "Wisdom" and "mighty works," in Mark and Matthew	119
§ 8 "The carpenter," in Mark and Matthew	120
§ 9 "Offended," in the Synoptists	124
§ 10 "Offended," in John	128

CONTENTS

	PAGE
§ 11 "Not without-honour," in Mark and Matthew	133
§ 12 "And he was not able to do there any mighty work," in Mark	137
§ 13 "And he marvelled because of their unbelief," in Mark	143

CHAPTER VI

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

[Mark vi. 6b—13]

§ 1 Johannine "sending of the apostles"	148
§ 2 Jesus "going round the villages in a circle," in Mark	152
§ 3 "He began to send them out by two and two," in Mark	155
§ 4 "Save a staff only," in Mark	158
§ 5 A parallel from the Essenes	161
§ 6 What corresponds to "the staff" in John?	165
§ 7 "Shod (R.V.) with sandals," in Mark	167
§ 8 What corresponds to "sandals" in John?	168
§ 9 "Scrip," "girdle," "purse"	170
§ 10 "Anointing with oil," in Mark and James	175
§ 11 "The sin unto death"	178
§ 12 "Anointing" among the Jews	180
§ 13 "Anointing [with oil]" metaphorical	183
§ 14 "Many that were infirm," in Mark	184
§ 15 Johannine tradition	187

CHAPTER VII

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

[Mark vi. 14—29]

§ 1 What was said after the Baptist's death	190
§ 2 The cause of the Baptist's death	195

CHAPTER VIII

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

[Mark vi. 29—44, and see vii. 24—ix. 1]

§ 1 The complexity of the evidence	203
§ 2 Traces of metaphor underlying the narratives about the "baskets"	209
§ 3 The immediate sequel of John the Baptist's death	216
§ 4 "And he saith unto them, Come ye...and rest a little," in Mark	219

CONTENTS

	PAGE
§ 5 "Come ye, [by] yourselves, apart, into a desert place," in Mark	223
§ 6 The concourse of "many," in Mark	226
§ 7 "They had no leisure so much as to eat," in Mark	233
§ 8 "To a desert place apart," in Mark and Matthew	237
§ 9 "In the boat," in Mark	241
§ 10 Signs of conflation in Mark	243
§ 11 "On foot," in Mark and Matthew	245
§ 12 "He had compassion," in Mark and Matthew	247
§ 13 "They were as sheep not having a shepherd," in Mark and Matthew	252
§ 14 "Shepherd" (<i>sing.</i>) nowhere mentioned by Luke	254
§ 15 "And he began to teach them many things," in Mark	256
§ 16 "When the day was now far spent," in Mark	261
§ 17 "They continue with me now three days," in Mark and Matthew	263
§ 18 "Buying" or "Whence?"	269
§ 19 "Two hundred pennyworth," in Mark and John	274
§ 20 "How many loaves have ye? Go [and] see," in Mark	283
§ 21 "There is a lad here," in John	286
§ 22 "Here," in all the Gospels	294
§ 23 "By companies," "by ranks," in Mark	296
§ 24 "On the green grass," in Mark	302
§ 25 "By hundreds and by fifties," in Mark	309
§ 26 "Taking," "blessing," and "looking up to heaven"	315
§ 27 "Breaking in pieces" or "breaking"	321
§ 28 "And the two fishes he divided among [them] all," in Mark	328
§ 29 "Twelve basketfuls" (R.V.), in Mark	336
§ 30 "They that ate the loaves," in Mark	344
§ 31 "Five thousand men" or "about five thousand [men]"	348
§ 32 Irenaeus and Origen on the "five thousand" in the Acts, and Clement of Alexandria on the "five loaves"	352
§ 33 "Give ye them to eat," why omitted by John	355
§ 34 "Eating" in the presence of the Lord	357
§ 35 "That he should give something to the poor," in John	360
§ 36 "We all partake of the one loaf"	363
§ 37 "Jesus...taketh the loaf and giveth to them," in John	365
§ 38 Christ's "leaven"	370
§ 39 The passionateness of the Eucharist	375
§ 40 The "kiss of love"	378
§ 41 "Testament" or "Covenant"	384
§ 42 "Testament" in the Gospels	392

CONTENTS

CHAPTER IX

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

[Mark vi. 45—52]

	PAGE
§ 1 The sequel of the Feeding of the Five Thousand . . .	403
§ 2 Christ's journeying in North Palestine . . .	407
§ 3 "Having (?) bidden them farewell," in Mark . . .	413
§ 4 "Distressed" and "the fourth watch of the night," in Mark and Matthew . . .	418
§ 5 "Distressed," differently applied in Mark and Matthew . . .	421
§ 6 How Peter "was grieved" by Jesus . . .	426
§ 7 "For they all saw him," in Mark . . .	429
§ 8 "An apparition," in Mark and Matthew . . .	430
§ 9 "But their heart was hardened," in Mark . . .	438

CHAPTER X

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

[Mark vi. 53—vii. 23]

§ 1 Jesus is followed at first by the multitudes . . .	442
§ 2 Jesus is attacked by the Pharisees concerning the washing of hands . . .	445
§ 3 The reply of Jesus to the Pharisees, in Mark and Matthew . . .	451
§ 4 The doctrine of Jesus on "purifying," in Matthew and Luke . . .	455
§ 5 Johannine Intervention . . .	458

CHAPTER XI

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

[Mark vii. 24—ix. 1¹]

§ 1 The Syrophenician woman . . .	464
§ 2 The first "sighing" of Jesus, in Mark . . .	467
§ 3 The second "sighing" of Jesus, in Mark . . .	474
§ 4 The disciples are said for the second time to have their "heart hardened," in Mark . . .	478
§ 5 Jesus lays His hands twice on a blind man and heals him, in Mark . . .	483

¹ See p. 464, n. *.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
§ 6 The Johannine healing of blindness	489
§ 7 "Prophet," "Son of Man," "Christ"	493
§ 8 "Get thee behind me, Satan," in Mark and Matthew .	498
§ 9 Variations in the expression of the New Law	501
§ 10 "Denying oneself"	506
§ 11 "Taking up the cross" and "following"	507
§ 12 "For my sake and the gospel's," in Mark	511
§ 13 "For what could a man give in exchange for his soul?" in Mark and Matthew	512
§ 14 "In this adulterous...generation," in Mark	515
§ 15 "With the angels that are holy," in Mark	518
§ 16 "When he cometh in the glory of his Father" . . .	522

INDICES

I	Scriptural Passages	529
II	English	543
III	Greek	570

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

REFERENCES

- (i) *a.* References to the first nine Parts of Diatessarica (as to which see pp. 574—5) are by paragraphs in black Arabic numbers:—

1—272 = *Clue*.
273—552 = *Corrections of Mark*.
553—1149 = *From Letter to Spirit*.
1150—1435 = *Paradosis*.
1436—1885 = *Johannine Vocabulary*.
1886—2799 = *Johannine Grammar*.
2800—2999 = *Notes on New Testament Criticism*.
3000—3635 = *The Son of Man*.
3636—3999 = *Light on the Gospel from an ancient Post*.

- (i) *b.* References to the Sections of the Tenth Part of Diatessarica, entitled *The Fourfold Gospel*, are by pages. The four Sections now completed are:—

(Section 1) *Introduction*.
(Section 2) *The Beginning*.
(Section 3) *The Proclamation of the New Kingdom*.
(Section 4) *The Law of the New Kingdom*.

- (ii) The Books of Scripture are referred to by the ordinary abbreviations, except where specified below. But when it is said that Samuel, Isaiah, Matthew, or any other writer, wrote this or that, it is to be understood as meaning *the writer, whoever he may be, of the words in question*, and not as meaning that the actual writer was Samuel, Isaiah, or Matthew.
- (iii) The principal Greek mss are denoted by \aleph , A, B, etc.; the Latin versions by *a*, *b*, etc., as usual. The Syriac version discovered by Mrs Lewis on Mount Sinai is referred to as SS, *i.e.* "Sinaitic Syrian." It is always quoted from Prof. Burkitt's translation. I regret that in the first three vols. of Diatessarica Mrs Lewis's name was omitted in connection with this version.
- (iv) The text of the Greek Old Testament adopted is that of B, edited by Prof. Swete; of the New, that of Westcott and Hort.
- (v) Modern works are referred to by the name of the work, or author, vol., and page, *e.g.* Levy iii. 343 *a*, *i.e.* vol. iii. p. 343, col. 1.

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

ABBREVIATIONS

- Aq. = Aquila's version of O.T.
Brederek = Brederek's *Konkordanz zum Targum Onkelos*, Giessen, 1906.
Burk. = Prof. F. C. Burkitt's *Evangelion Da-mepharreshe*, Cambridge University Press, 1904.
Chr. = *Chronicles*.
Clem. Alex. 42 = Clement of Alexandria in Potter's page 42.
Dalman, *Words* = *Words of Jesus*, Eng. Transl. 1902; *Aram.*
G. = *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, 1894.
En. = Enoch ed. Charles, Clarendon Press, 1893.
Ency. = *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, A. & C. Black, 1899.
Ephrem = Ephraemus Syrus, ed. Moesinger.
Etheridge = Etheridge's translations of the Targums on the Pentateuch.
Euseb. = the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius.
Field = Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, Oxford, 1875, also Otium Norvicense, 1881.
Gesen. = the Oxford edition of Gesenius.
Goldschm. = *Der Babylonische Talmud*, 1897—1912, ed. Goldschmidt.
Goodspeed = Goodspeed's *Indices*, (i) *Patristicus*, Leipzig, 1907, (ii) *Apologeticus*, Leipzig, 1912.
Hastings = Dictionary of the Bible, ed. Hastings (5 vols.).
Hor. Heb. = *Horae Hebraicae*, by John Lightfoot, 1658—74, ed. Gandell, Oxf. 1859.
Iren. = the treatise of Irenaeus against Heresies.
Jer. Targ. or Targ. Jer. (abbrev. for Jerusalem Targum), or Jon. Targ. (*i.e.* Targum of Jonathan, abbrev. for the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan) = the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch, of which there are two recensions—both quoted (*Notes on N.T. Criticism*, Pref. p. viii) by ancient authorities under the name "Jerusalem Targum." The two recensions are severally denoted by Jer. I and Jer. II. On other books, the Targum is referred to as simply "Targ."
Jon. Targ., see Jer. Targ.
Justin = Justin Martyr (*Apol.* = his First Apology, *Tryph.* = the Dialogue with Trypho).
K. = *Kings*.
Krauss = Krauss's *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter* etc., Part II, Berlin, 1899.

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

Levy = Levy's *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, 4 vols., Leipzig, 1889; Levy Ch. = *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols., 1881.

L.S. = Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon.

Mechilta, see Wü(nsche).

Onk. = the Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch.

Origen is referred to variously, e.g. *Hom. Exod.* ii. 25 = lib. ii. ch. 25 of *Hom. Exod.*, but Orig. on *Exod.* ii. 25 = the commentary *ad loc.*; Lomm. iii. 24 = vol. iii. p. 24 of Lommatzsch's edition.

Oxf. Conc. = *The Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint*.

Pec. = peculiar to the writer mentioned in the context.

Pesikta, see Wü(nsche).

Philo is referred to by Mangey's volume and page, e.g. *Philo* ii. 234, or, as to Latin treatises, by the Scripture text or Aucher's pages (P. A.).

Pistis = *Pistis Sophia*, ed. Petermann (marginal pages).

Ps. Sol. = *Psalms of Solomon*, ed. Ryle and James, Cambr. 1891.

R., after Gen., Exod., Lev. etc. means *Rabboth*, and refers to Wünsche's edition of the Midrash on the Pentateuch, e.g. *Gen.* v. (on *Gen.* xii. 2, Wü. p. 177).

Rashi, sometimes quoted from Breithaupt's translation, 1714.

S. = *Samuel*; s. = "see."

Schöttg. = Schöttgen's *Horae Hebraicae*, Dresden and Leipzig, 1733.

Sir. = the work of Ben Sira, i.e. the son of Sira. It is commonly called *Ecclesiasticus* (see *Clus* 20 a). The original Hebrew used in this work is that which has been edited, in part, by Cowley and Neubauer, Oxf. 1897; in part, by Schechter and Taylor, Cambr. 1899; in part, by G. Margoliouth, *Jewish Quart. Rev.*, Oct. 1899 (also printed in *About Hebrew Manuscripts* (Frowde, 1905) by Mr E. N. Adler, who discovered the missing chapters).

SS, see (iii) above.

Steph. Thes. = *Stephani Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (Didot).

Sym. = Symmachus's version of O.T.

Targ. (by itself) is used where only one Targum is extant on the passage quoted.

Targ. Jer., Targ. Jon., and Targ. Onk., see Jer. Targ., Jon. Targ., and Onk., above.

Tehillim = Midrash on Psalms, ed. Wünsche (2 vols.).

Test. xii Patr. = Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs ed. Charles, 1908 (Gk, Clarendon Press, Eng., A. & C. Black).

Theod. = Theodotion's version of O.T.

Thes. Syr. = Payne Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus*, Oxf. 1901.

Tromm. = Trommius' *Concordance to the Septuagint*.

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

Tryph. = the Dialogue between Justin Martyr and Trypho the Jew.

Walton = *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*, 1657.

Wetst. = Wetstein's *Comm. on the New Testament*, Amsterdam, 1751.

W.H. = Westcott and Hort's New Testament.

Wü. = Wünsche's translation of *Rabboth* etc., 1880—1909 (including *Mechilta*, *Pesikta Rab Kahana*, *Tehillim* etc.).

(a) A bracketed Arabic number, following Mk, Mt., etc. indicates the number of instances in which a word occurs in Mark, Matthew, etc., e.g. ἀγάπη Mk (6), Mt. (1), Lk. (1), Jn (7).

(b) Where verses in Hebrew, Greek, and Revised Version, are numbered differently, the number of R.V. is given alone.

(c) In transliterating a Hebrew, Aramaic, or Syriac word, preference has often, but not invariably, been given to that form which best reveals the connection between the word in question and forms of it familiar to English readers. Where a word is not transliterated, it is often indicated (for the sake of experts) by a reference to Gesen., *Thes. Syr.*, Levy, or Levy *Ch.*

CHAPTER I

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

[Mark iv. 1—34]

§ 1. Christ's "parables" or "things hidden"¹

MATTHEW concludes his exposition of what he calls Christ's "parables" with the words "That it might be fulfilled which

¹ In this chapter it has not been found possible to treat of small differences of expression in the Synoptic texts printed below. One of them—the passage where Luke (viii. 13) substitutes "in time of temptation they *fall away*," for the tradition of Mark (closely followed by Matthew) "When tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, straightway they *stumble*"—will be referred to later on in discussing Mk vi. 3 "and they were offended in him." The present chapter does not enter into verbal detail except where some Marcan phrase omitted or altered by Luke demands consideration.

In the parallel passages printed below, and for the most part in others printed in footnotes, R.V. text is followed (with a very few occasional deviations indicated by brackets) as being convenient for rapid reference enabling the reader to take a broad view of the subject under consideration. But in the detailed study of the Greek text, R.V. text is frequently departed from.

Here and elsewhere the parallel Synoptic texts are printed below in full, not for continuous reading along with the remarks made above, but for the convenience of rapid reference when the reader desires to know the context of any passage under discussion.

Mk iv. 1—20 (R.V.)

(1) And again he began to teach by the sea side. And there is gathered unto him a very great multitude, so that he entered into a boat, and

Mt. xiii. 1—23 (R.V.)

(1) On that day went Jesus out of the house, and sat by the sea side.

(2) And there were gathered unto him great multitudes,

Lk. viii. 4—15 (R.V.)

(4) And when a great multitude came together, and they of every city resorted unto him, he spake by a parable:

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

was spoken by the prophet, saying, 'I will open my mouth in

Mk iv. 1—20 (R.V.)
contd.

sat in the sea; and all the multitude were by the sea on the land.

(2) And he taught them many things in parables, and said unto them in his teaching,

(3) Hearken: Behold, the sower went forth to sow:

(4) And it came to pass, as he sowed, some [seed] fell by the way side, and the birds came and devoured it.

(5) And other fell on the rocky [ground], where it had not much earth; and straightway it sprang up, because it had no deepness of earth:

(6) And when the sun was risen, it was scorched; and because it had no root, it withered away.

(7) And other fell among the thorns, and the thorns grew up, and choked it, and it yielded no fruit.

(8) And others fell into the good ground, and yielded fruit, growing up and increasing; and brought forth, thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold.

(9) And he said, Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

(10) And when he was alone, they that

Mt. xiii. 1—23 (R.V.)
contd.

so that he entered into a boat, and sat; and all the multitude stood on the beach.

(3) And he spake to them many things in parables, saying, Behold, the sower went forth to sow;

(4) And as he sowed, some [seeds] fell by the way side, and the birds came and devoured them:

(5) And others fell upon the rocky places, where they had not much earth: and straightway they sprang up, because they had no deepness of earth:

(6) And when the sun was risen, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away.

(7) And others fell upon the thorns; and the thorns grew up, and choked them:

(8) And others fell upon the good ground, and yielded fruit, some a hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty.

(9) He that hath ears (some anc. auth. add to hear), let him hear.

(10) And the disciples came, and said

Lk. viii. 4—15 (R.V.)
contd.

(5) The sower went forth to sow his seed: and as he sowed, some fell by the way side; and it was trodden under foot, and the birds of the heaven devoured it.

(6) And other fell on the rock; and as soon as it grew, it withered away because it had no moisture.

(7) And other fell amidst the thorns; and the thorns grew with it, and choked it.

(8) And other fell into the good ground, and grew, and brought forth fruit a hundredfold. As he said these things, he cried, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

(9) And his disciples asked him

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

parables, I will utter [*things*] *hidden* from the foundation [of the

Mk iv. 1—20 (R.V.)
contd.

were about him with the twelve asked of him the parables.

(11) And he said unto them, Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables:

(12) That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them.

(13) And he saith unto them, Know ye not this parable? and how shall ye know all the parables?

(14) The sower soweth the word.

(15) And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; and when they have heard, straightway cometh Satan, and taketh away the word which hath been sown in them.

(16) And these in like manner are they that are sown upon the rocky [places], who, when they have heard the word, straightway receive (λαμβάνουσιν) it with joy;

(17) And they have no root in themselves, but endure

Mt. xiii. 1—23 (R.V.)
contd.

unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables?

(11) And he answered and said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given.

(12) For whosoever hath,... to him...

(13) Therefore speak I to them in parables; because seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.

.....
(15) ...Lest haply they should...and should turn again, and I should heal them.

.....
(18) Hear then ye the parable of the sower.

(19) When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, [then] cometh the evil [one], and snatcheth away that which hath been sown in his heart. This is he that was sown by the way side.

(20) And he that was sown upon the rocky places, this is he that heareth the word, and straightway with joy receiveth (λαμβάνων) it;

(21) Yet hath he

Lk. viii. 4—15 (R.V.)
contd.

what this parable might be.

(10) And he said, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God: but to the rest in parables; that seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand.

(11) Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God.

(12) And those by the way side are they that have heard; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word from their heart, that they may not believe and be saved.

(13) And those on the rock [are] they which, when they have heard, receive (δύονται) the word with joy; and these have no root, which for a while believe,

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

world¹.'" This is a free quotation from a Psalm of Asaph, "I will open my mouth in a parable², I will utter *enigmas*, or, *riddles* of old³." The "riddles" appear to be the mysterious dispensations by which God is described in this long Psalm as

Mk iv. 1—20 (R.V.)
contd.

for a while; then, when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, straightway they stumble.

(18) And others are they that are sown among the thorns; these are they that have heard the word,

(19) And the cares of the world (*or*, age), and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful.

(20) And those are they that were sown upon the good ground; such as hear the word, and accept it, and bear fruit, thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold.

Mt. xiii. 1—23 (R.V.)
contd.

not root in himself, but endureth for a while; and when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, straightway he stum-
bleth.

(22) And he that was sown among the thorns, this is he that heareth the word; and the care of the world (*or*, age), and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful.

(23) And he that was sown upon the good ground, this is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it; who verily beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some a hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty.

Lk. viii. 4—15 (R.V.)
contd.

and in time of temptation fall away.

(14) And that which fell among the thorns, these are they that have heard, and as they go on their way they are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of [this] life, and bring no fruit to perfection.

(15) And that in the good ground, these are such as in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, hold it fast, and bring forth fruit with patience.

¹ Mt. xiii. 35 ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου, ἐραύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς.

² Ps. lxxviii. 2 (LXX) ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς (Aq. ἐν παραβολῇ, Sym. διὰ παροιμίας) τὸ στόμα μου.

³ Ps. lxxviii. 2 (LXX) φθίγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, Aq. δμβρήσω αἰνίγματα ἐξ ἀρχῆθεν, Sym. ἀναβλύσω προβλήματα ἀρχαία. The Heb. נִתְּנָה = αἰνίγμα (4), διήγημα *or* διήγησις (2), πρόβλημα (10). Πρόβλημα (Judg. xiv. 12—19) means (8 times) "riddle." In Ps. xlix. 4 "I will open my *enigma* on the harp," the "enigma" appears to be the temporary prosperity of those who fear not God and who are (*ib.* 20) 'like the beasts that perish.' Matthew paraphrases "riddle" as

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

permitting Israel to rebel against Him and to need His chastening in the course of their national growth. The growth went on, but, along with it, there went apparent waste. Isaiah puts such a "riddle" venturesomely before us when he represents Israel as crying "O Lord, why dost thou make us to err from thy ways, and *hardenest our heart* from thy fear¹?" Isaiah also writes "Thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel. the Saviour²"; and he represents even the Chosen Servant, in apparent discouragement, as saying—or at all events as having once said to the Lord—"I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for nought and vanity³."

Jesus is brought before us by all the Synoptists, in the Parable of the Sower, as recognising the danger of converting the God of Israel into "a God that hides Himself." According to Mark and Luke, He places this danger before His disciples in language borrowed from Isaiah about a judicial sentence of blindness ("in order that, seeing, they may see and yet not

κεκρυμμένα. But Paul retains the thought in 1 Cor. xiii. 12 βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι δι' ὁσέωντος ἐν αἰνίγματι—the only N.T. instance of αἶνιγμα.

In Mk iv. 11 ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται, "for those outside *all things take place* in parables," τὰ πάντα γίνεται has a force that seems to have escaped Matthew and Luke. The parables were not wholly "parables" (that is, obscure sayings, as in Ezek. xx. 49 "Doth he not speak *parables* (הַשְׁרָא)?") to those who had some power of spiritual hearing and seeing. Jesus endeavoured to teach with clearness, as the actors in a play try to speak with clearness. But "all things took place in parables" for those who were deaf to the voice of the Spirit that inspired the Teacher. Similarly, for the deaf, in a theatre, "*all things take place* in dumb show."

¹ Is. lxiii. 17 (where R.V. margin refers us to Is. vi. 10, and Jn xii. 40). Ibn Ezra accepts the words on the ground that "God is the highest, first cause of everything," but adds other explanations.

² Is. xlv. 15, where Ibn Ezra protests against the paraphrase "an invisible God." Comp. *ib.* lvii. 17 "For the iniquity of his covetousness...I hid [myself]."

³ Is. xlix. 3—4 "He said unto me, Thou art my servant, Israel, in whom I will be glorified. But I said, I have laboured...."

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

behold")¹. The language seems to represent the teaching by parables as itself causing, and intended to cause, the blindness. Matthew softens this. John, on the other hand, commenting on the reasons why the Jews did not accept the teaching of Jesus, says, "For this cause *they were not able to believe*, because Isaiah said again, *He hath blinded their eyes and he hardened their heart, lest they should see with their eyes and perceive with their heart*, and should turn, and I should heal them"²."

This "riddle," or "dark saying," about the "hardening" of Israel's heart by God, is one side of what Paul calls a "mystery" when he says to the Romans "I would not, brethren, have you ignorant of this *mystery*...that a *hardening* in part hath befallen Israel"³." But there is another side, expressed in the following words—"until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in"—so that the "mystery," as a whole, means the issue of good out of evil, and of redemption out of stumbling. The recognition of this particular "mystery" is a comfort to Paul as a teacher of the Gospel⁴. A similar recognition of the general "mystery" of the Gospel's success through apparent failure seems to be implied in the Parable of the Sower, or rather in the explanation of it subsequently given by Jesus when He says to the disciples—in Mark—"Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God." Justin Martyr says, in his only reference to this Parable, "As my Lord said, 'The sower went forth to sow the seed, and some fell...and some on good ground'; I must speak, then, in the hope that there may be

¹ So Mk iv. 12 with "*in order that*," *ἵνα...μή θεωσιν* and sim. Lk. viii. 10 *ἵνα...μή βλέπωσιν*, but Mt. xiii. 13 with "*because*," *ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν*.

² Jn xii. 39—40. Comp. *ib.* ix. 39 "For judgment came I into this world, that they that see not may see; and that they that see may become blind," with the following question of the Pharisees "Are we also blind?" and Christ's reply.

³ Rom. xi. 25.

⁴ Rom. xi. 25—33 concluding "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God!"

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

good ground somewhere¹." And Origen, quoting words peculiar to Mark, "He that soweth soweth the word," says "Who are they that sow? It is those who bring forth the word of God in the Church. Let the teachers therefore hearken...", and the context warns us that the word of God must not be "contaminated by those who sow it²."

These two ancient references warn us against assuming that the Parable of the Sower was intended merely to teach every disciple of Christ to be on his guard against the evil influences that might destroy the seed of the Gospel in his own soul. It teaches that, but it teaches also more than that. It is adapted for him as a preacher of the Gospel—which every disciple of Christ is supposed to be—as well as for him as a hearer of it. In the Psalm already referred to, Asaph begins by saying "Give ear, O my people, to my law," and terminates his "riddles," or "dark sayings," by shewing how Israel, through innumerable failures, was led at last successfully into the fold of its Shepherd³. Jesus, preparing His disciples to proclaim the New Law, teaches them that there are as many phases of failure as of success⁴; and His allusion to Isaiah indicates that He perceived Israel itself, the Chosen People—with its bewildering mixture of arrogance and ignorance, spiritual possibilities and carnal realisations—to be in some sense a failure and a "riddle⁵."

¹ *Tryph.* § 125.

² Origen, *Levit. Hom.* xii. 7 (*Lomm.* ix. 396). Origen is referring to the "contamination" mentioned in Lev. xxi. 14—15. But his words suggest that the "birds" and "thorns" and other influences that destroy the seed of the Gospel, might be mentioned in warnings to teachers as well as to hearers.

³ Ps. lxxviii. 1, 70—72.

⁴ The three classes of success, recognised in Mk iv. 8 (Mt. xiii. 8), Mk iv. 20 (Mt. xiii. 23) are not recognised in the parall. Lk. viii. 8, 15.

⁵ Compare Pope's sceptical couplet on Man as the angels regard him:—

"Sole judge of truth, in endless error hurled,
The glory, jest, and riddle of the world."

Essay on Man, ii. 17—18.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

But every Hebrew prophet knew that there was to be a solution to the "riddle" of Jehovah and a success through His temporary appearances of failure, so that when Isaiah heard the astounding message, "Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears," he answered at once, "Lord, how long¹?" knowing that this was but a means to an end. Jesus could not have fallen below this standard of prophetic hopefulness. The three Synoptists have variously reported His quotation of Isaiah's words, and the Fourth Evangelist has quoted them in his own person in a separate form². These variations must be carefully studied. But we must study them always on the lines of Hebrew and Jewish thought, and always in adherence to the rule that, where the Gospels vary, a difficult and rough Hebraistic tradition is probably truer than a smooth Hellenistic form of it.

§ 2. "*Hear ye*," in Mark³

Matthew and Luke omit this, and so does the Diatessaron. It might allude to the "*hear thou*" in Deuteronomy ("*Hear thou*, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord⁴"). But there would seem to be more appropriateness in an allusion to the Psalm of Asaph above quoted "*Hearken thou*, O my people, to my law... I will open my mouth in a *parable*⁵." Matthew and

¹ Is. vi. 10—11.

² Jn xii. 40.

³ Mk iv. 2—3 "...and said unto them in his teaching, *Hearken* (ἀκούετε)..." om. in Mt. xiii. 3, Lk. viii. 4—5. Comp. the answers to the question as to which was the "first" or great commandment:—Mk xii. 29 (to "one of the scribes") "The first is, *Hear* (ἀκούε), O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one, and thou shalt love...", Mt. xxii. 37 (to "a lawyer") "Thou shalt love..." Luke, in a different context, represents "a lawyer" as replying to Jesus (x. 27) "Thou shalt love..." without the prefatory "*hear*."

⁴ Deut. vi. 4.

⁵ Ps. lxxviii. 1—2 LXX "attend ye (προσέχετε)," Aq. ἐνσπρίζου. The Heb. = forms of ἀκούω (3), ἐνσπρίζομαι (26), προσέχω (7).

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

Luke may have omitted "Hear ye" as being too strong a phrase to introduce a single parable in a course of parabolic teaching in which Jesus (as Mark and Matthew say) "taught" the people "many things in parables." But if the parable introduces a new spiritual "law" in which two kinds of "hearing" are distinguished, and the right kind of "hearing" is regarded as resulting in a regeneration of the hearer, then Mark is justified in the prominence that he gives to the Saviour's initial command to "hearken."

John—though he never represents Jesus as saying "Hearken ye," or as quoting the formula "Hear, O Israel"—distinguishes in a very careful and subtle way between passive hearing and receptive hearing¹. When Jesus for the first time mentions "hearing," it is in a dialogue with Nicodemus to whom He is attempting to explain the doctrine of regeneration through the Spirit². After first stating it in general terms ("except *any one* be born from above") He insists that it applies to Nicodemus himself and to his associates, the Pharisees, who are deaf to the inner meaning of the Spirit: "Marvel not that I said unto thee that *thou and thy associates*³ must be born from above. The Spirit breatheth, or bloweth, where it willeth⁴, and *thou hearest* [the mere sound of] its voice, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth," that is to say its source or motive, and

¹ See *Joh. Voc.* 1614 b—c on the Johannine ἀκούω with accus. and with genit. In Jn v. 25 Westcott rightly paraphrases ὁ ἀκούωντες as "those who receive it." The meaning is "those who take it in through hearing."

² Jn iii. 3—8.

³ "Thou and thy associates" = ὑμᾶς, in δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν. Ὑμᾶς is made emphatic by its superfluity. The natural phrase would have been δεῖ γεννηθῆναι, "one must needs be born." But Jesus means "You and your friends the Pharisees, who think yourselves superior to such a need."

⁴ On the play on the word πνεῦμα, see *Joh. Voc.* 1655, and add that πνεῦμα is taken as the Spirit by Origen *Num. Hom.* xxvii. 13 (Lomm. x. 363), *De Princip.* i. 4 (Lomm. xxi. 76), and by Jerome (*Letters* lviii. 3).

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

its object or purpose. This is an appeal as it were to all the Scribes or Teachers of Israel, in the person of Nicodemus, to whom Jesus says "Art thou the teacher of Israel and dost thou not recognise these things¹?"

Later on, an instance of this sound, or voice, of the Spirit, and of its being misunderstood—but on this occasion not by Pharisees, but by the multitude and by others—is presented dramatically: "There came a voice from heaven, 'I have both glorified it and will glorify it again.' The multitude therefore that was standing *and heard* [it] said that it had thundered; others said 'An angel hath spoken to him².'" Here the misunderstood voice follows immediately on a proclamation of the doctrine about the grain of wheat, "If it die, it beareth much fruit³." This is, in effect, a brief repetition of the doctrine of regeneration through the Spirit and at the same time a suggestion of a new aspect of a detail in the Parables of Sowing. And both the Johannine passages call attention to the importance of the right kind of "hearing"—as Mark does in the tradition under discussion.

§ 3. *When did the disciples "ask Jesus the parables"?*

The Synoptists differ here. Mark writes, "And when he was alone, they that were about him with the Twelve began to ask (or, used to ask) [of] him *the parables*⁴." Mark has

¹ Jn iii. 10.

² Jn xii. 28—9.

³ Jn xii. 24.

⁴ Mk iv. 10 *καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας ἡρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα τὰς παραβολάς*, Mt. xiii. 10 *καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Διὰ τί ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖς αὐτοῖς*; Lk. viii. 9 *ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τίς αὕτη εἴη ἡ παραβολή*. In Mk, Codex D has (instead of *τὰς παραβολάς*) *τίς ἡ παραβολή αὕτη*, and so have a, b, c etc. (see Swete). Origen (*Comm. Matth.*, Lomm. iv. 193), after quoting Mt. and Lk. correctly, says "Marcus vero sic, 'Et cum facti fuissent secreti, interrogabant eum discipuli quae esset parabola haec.'" Diatess. also has "And when they were alone." See p. 45 foll., "Private 'expounding' in Mark."

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

previously written, "Jesus began (*or, used*) to teach them *many things* in parables, and said to them in [the course of] his teaching¹," after which he places the Parable of the Sower. The two statements imply that the disciples did not ask the meaning of the Parable of the Sower separately, and immediately. But the parallel Luke expressly says that they did ("they began to question him *what this parable was*"). Matthew gives the question quite a different turn, "Why speakest thou to them in parables?" But he does not say that the disciples waited to ask this till Jesus was "alone." He merely says that they "came to" Jesus to ask it. This does not imply an interval of any long duration. Mark's tradition appears to have been corrected by Matthew and Luke partly because of its verbal, and partly because of its historical, difficulty. Verbally, though "ask" could be used with two accusatives in such phrases as "ask him *the name*," "ask him *the meaning*," it could hardly be used in "asked him *the parables*," unless it meant "asked him what secret meaning he implied²."

That Mark does actually use "parable" here to mean "secret meaning of the parable," appears probable from another passage where Jesus maintains that a man is defiled not by what goes into him but by what comes out of him. Concerning this astounding paradox—as it would appear to most Jews—Mark says that Christ's disciples "*questioned him [about] the parable*," where Matthew avoids the word "question" and

¹ Mk iv. 2 *καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλὰ, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ....*

² Steph. Thes. in a very long note on *ἐρωτάω* = "ask concerning," quotes only (1) "Aristoph. [?] *ἐρωτῶν πόλιν*," an error (see Aristoph. Pax 688), and (2) Plato Pol. 508 A τὸν ἥλιον *ἐρωτῆς*. The latter follows the question "Whom can you mention as the Causer of light?" and means "You are asking me [the name of] the Sun."

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

represents Peter as saying to Jesus, "*Tell us the parable*¹." In both narratives, "*parable*" seems to mean "*the secret at the bottom of the parable*."

If that is Mark's meaning, his language may be illustrated (as often) from Hermas—almost the only very early Patristic writer that uses the word "*parable*²." Hermas gives us a whole book of Parables, written down at the direction of the Shepherd. The sense he sometimes attaches to the word may be inferred from his replying—when the Shepherd tells him that grief destroys man and crushes out the Holy Spirit—"My Lord, I am of no understanding and do not understand *these parables*, for I do not perceive how grief is able to crush and [yet] again to save³." This usage is not that of literary Greek—a fact that may be illustrated by Justin Martyr's non-use of the

¹ Mk vii. 17

Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολήν.

Mt. xv. 15

Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ Φράσον ἡμῖν τὴν παραβολήν.

Here Mark describes Jesus as going into a "house" where Matthew does not; and it becomes necessary to remember that "*the house of Hillel*" would be a familiar phrase for "*the disciples of Hillel*" (Son 3480 c).

Ἐπερωτᾶν is quoted by Steph. Thes. from Herod. ix. 93 ἐπειρώτεον τοὺς προφήτας τὸ αἰτιον, and from Dion. Cass. lviii. 15 δίκας...ἐπερώτων, "disceptans," but not in such a phrase as Mark's.

² Besides Hermas, Goodspeed gives only Barn. vi. 10 "What then is the meaning of (λίγει) 'unto the good land...(Exod. xxxiii. 1, 3)?...' The prophet means (or, says) (λίγει) a *parable of the Lord* [i.e. Jesus]," and ib. xvii. 2 "If I write to you about things impending or future ye will not understand, because they are involved in parables (διὰ τὸ ἐν παραβολαῖς κείσθαι)."

³ Herm. Mand. x. 1. 3. The context calls such sayings (ib. 4) τὰς παραβολὰς τῆς θεότητος. They may be sometimes called "spiritual paradoxes." Comp. Mand. xi. 18 foll. "listen, then, to the *paradox* (παραβολήν) I am going to tell you." It is (among others) this—that a drop of water, which going up from below does nothing, when coming [down] from above does much; whence we are to infer that "the divine Spirit coming [down] from above is powerful," and to "believe" in that Spirit, but to "abstain" from the other, i.e. from the spirit of this world.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

word "parable" in his Apologies. In the Dialogue with the Jew he uses it a dozen times, but in the Apologies not once¹. In literary Greek "parable" means comparison or illustration, without any suggestion of obscurity, paradox, or riddle².

Accepting, then, the Marcan meaning of "parables" to be something like "dark sayings," "riddles," or "paradoxes," we have to ask—since Matthew and Luke omit the Marcan statement about Christ's being "alone"—"How and where, if at all, does John intervene? As regards the word 'parable,' we know that John never mentions it. But he does introduce the *thought*, under the word *paroimia*, or 'proverb.' What then has John to say about Christ's use of 'proverbs' to His disciples either 'when he was alone' (as Mark says) or otherwise?"

John appears to have a definite and consistent theory about Christ's "proverbs," and to believe that Jesus *did not and could not explain them to the disciples while He was on earth*³. The reason may be because the application of the proverbs was personal, and the Person, the Son, was not to be comprehended by the disciples till the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, should come into their hearts. In any case John gives us the impression that, before the departure of the Son to the Father, everything that Jesus had said was a "proverb" to them, that is to say, an obscure saying⁴. It is true that, when Jesus Himself warns the disciples of this, the disciples contradict Him: "Now

¹ He uses it always about O.T. and always in the dative ("in a parable," or "parables") often along with words implying (*Tryph.* § 52) "hidden meaning," (*ib.* § 68) "mysteries or symbols," (*ib.* § 77) "similitudes," (*ib.* § 78) "mystery," (*ib.* § 90) "types," etc., and often with a mention of the Holy Spirit (*ib.* §§ 36, 52, etc.).

² See Steph. *Thes.* and L. S. which explain the Aristotelian use of *παράβολοι*.

³ See *Proclamation* pp. 438—43.

⁴ Jn xvi. 25 "These things I have spoken unto you *in proverbs*; the hour cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs...." On this, Westcott says "It seems to be unnatural to limit the reference to the answer to the question in xvi. 17. The description applies in fact to all the earthly teaching of the Lord."

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

speakest thou plainly and speakest *no proverb*." They suppose that they are safe in an intellectual conviction of Christ's omniscience and consequent divinity ("Now know we that thou knowest all things...by this we believe that thou camest forth from God"). But they are woefully mistaken. In a few minutes they will abandon Him¹.

This leads us to a fairly probable conclusion about the historical fact latent in Mark (the time when Jesus was "alone"), and to a highly probable conclusion about John's view of Mark. Mark seems—or at all events seemed to John—to have placed out of order, and before Christ's resurrection, a course of post-resurrectional revelation concerning Christ's parables that was not given till Jesus was "alone," that is, in the circle of the disciples and the Twelve². Matthew and Luke, being misled by Mark's order, retained his order but altered his tradition³. John has altered Mark's order but retains a recognition that Christ's parables, or proverbs, were obscure, and needed to be explained by the Holy Spirit⁴.

¹ See Jn xvi. 29—32.

² Such a circle of disciples, which might be described by Jews (*Son* 3460 c) as "the household," or "house," of Jesus, is described in Acts i. 15. Those who were outside that circle might be described as Mk iv. 11 *ἐκείνους τοῖς ἑξῆς*. Mt. xiii. 11 *ἐκείνους* and Lk. viii. 10 *τοῖς λοιποῖς* omit *ἑξῆς*, which perhaps some interpreted literally as meaning "outside the house."

³ Luke's view—that the questioning related merely to the single (viii. 9) "parable" of the Sower—had some justification. No other parable presented so many difficulties. Why did the Sower sow seed "by the way side"? Why had he not removed the stones and the thorns? How different from the planter of the vine in Isaiah, who (v. 2) "made a trench," and "gathered out the stones," and was able to say (v. 4) "What could have been done more?" The difference could perhaps be explained. But it appeared to need explanation.

⁴ If this Marcan tradition refers to a period after the Resurrection what have we to say as to the mention of (Mk iv. 10) "*those around Jesus*," along with the Twelve? Does John represent them at the end of his Gospel, as well as at the beginning, in the person of

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

§ 4. "The mystery of the kingdom," in Mark¹

Delitzsch renders "mystery" here by the Hebrew "secret," meaning "confidential intercourse." This has quite a different meaning from that of the Greek word *mustērion*, which meant "initiation." The Hebrew word is never used in the plural². Both in English and in Greek the word "mystery" is quite unfit to represent the phrase "the secret of God" as it is used in the Bible³.

A Greek "mystery" implied that some Greek God or Goddess (for example Demeter in her temple at Eleusis) was "manifested" to his or her initiated worshippers by some visible form or sign. Hence, to Greeks, Philip's appeal to Jesus "Shew us the Father" would seem to imply "Reveal to us a *mystery*"; and the reply of Jesus to another disciple, a little afterwards, that He with His Father would "come" and "abide with" anyone that "loved" and obeyed Him, would

Nathanael? It is possible, but in any case it is not an instance of Johannine intervention. For Luke also (xxiv. 18, 27, 43) represents Cleopas (and a companion) as receiving from Jesus an exposition of the Scriptures concerning Himself, and afterwards as receiving proofs of His resurrection.

¹ Mk iv. 11 Ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δίδεται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, Mt. xiii. 11 Ὑμῖν δίδεται γινῶαι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν (Lk. viii. 10 τοῦ θεοῦ).

² See Gesen. 691 b.

³ Ps. xxv. 14. Prov. iii. 32. In Job xxix. 4 "the secret of God was upon my tent" the reading is disputed, but it seems to make good sense, meaning "the stamp of God's favour." During the days of Job's prosperity there was, as it were, written on his tent; "Here is one of the intimates of God" (Gesen. Ps. xxv. 14, "intimacy with Jehovah"). Comp. *Odes of Solomon* viii. 11—14 "Guard my secret, ye that are guarded by it. Guard my faith...know my knowledge...Love me with fervent-love, ye that are loving."

On "the secret of the Lord" see *Light* 3797—817, and on "mysteries" see 3798 foll. and 3802 b—j.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

fill the mind of the ordinary Greek with astonishment¹. Yet that is the meaning of the Hebrew phrase "the secret of God." It meant "confidential intercourse," or "intimacy," with Jehovah.

Independently of this difference between Hebrew and popular Greek thought, there is also a great difference between those to whom "*the mystery of the kingdom of God has been given*" and those to whom "*it has been given*" merely "*to know*" its "*mysteries*." Mark has the former phrase, Matthew and Luke the latter². By "*the mysteries*" might be meant—at all

¹ Jn xiv. 9, 23. We must however distinguish "the ordinary Greek" from such a philosopher as Epictetus. Epictetus believes man to be, by right, "a god"—a god in all the most homely acts of life—and reproaches him for ignoring his own divinity: (ii. 8. 12) "When thou art eating...knowest thou not that thou art sustaining a god...? Thou carriest about (περιφέρεις) (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 10) God, poor-wretch, and knowest it not!" comp. ii. 16. 33 "But if thou followest-faithfully (παρακολουθεῖς) Him who swayeth the universe, and carriest Him about (περιφέρεις) in thyself." Also, in the only passage (iii. 21. 13—16) where Epictetus mentions "mysteries," he pours scorn on those who think they can reproduce the mysteries of Eleusis by reproducing the material circumstances—the "building," the "hierophant," the "herald," the "torch-bearer," "the very same voices." There is need, he says, that a man should "have previously purified himself and be predisposed by the reflection that he is on the point of drawing near things holy [in themselves] and holy by reason of their antiquity." This passage is preceded by the saying "Men do not sow till they have invoked Demeter." The only other mention of Demeter is contained in the ironical reproach against certain philosophers who denied what most people would call the evidence of the senses (ii. 20. 32): "Grateful creatures and reverent! They eat their daily bread and yet are not deterred from saying 'We know not whether there is a Demeter or a Proserpine or a Pluto'"—that is, the gods whose action typified the seed and the harvest, death and resurrection.

² It should be noted that סֵתֶרֶת is used in New Hebrew (Levy iii. 166, "gr. τὸ μυστήριον, od. τὰ μυστήρια") and in Aramaic (Levy Ch. ii. 51 "gr. μυστήρια") and is variously regarded as sing. or pl. (Krauss 346 "das Geheimniss, oft irrthümlich als Pl. behandelt"). Walton and Etheridge render it "secrets" in Gen. xxviii. 12 (Jer. I) "because they had revealed the secrets of the

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

events for Christians at the end of the first century reading the Synoptic Gospels—the mysteries of the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Jesus, and of Baptism and the Eucharist for His disciples. But by “*the mystery*” must be meant some supreme and all-including “mystery,” such as Paul suggests when he speaks about the “recognition of *the mystery of God, [namely] Christ*¹.” About “*the mysteries*” we may say “we know them,” more appropriately than about “*the mystery*,” which is better regarded as being received into our souls through faith and feeling (and not merely through evidence and proof).

If we ask what the Marcan mystery is, we find the answer somewhat complicated by various possibilities as to the time and circumstances in which Jesus uttered the word, and by doubts whether He referred to one particular parable, or to many, and to the principle underlying them all. But many reasons may be given for concluding that He referred to the underlying principle, the principle of the divine redemption of the soul. This is confirmed by the earlier Clement's comment on “The sower went forth²,” and by Isaiah's likening of God's forgiveness of sins to “the rain that cometh down from heaven” and “giveth seed to the sower³.” It appears to be the mystery of life through death or dissolution. Clement points out how “the Sower casteth into the earth each one of the seeds,”

Lord of the world,” but “secret” in Numb. xvi. 26 “they betrayed my *secret* when I slew the Egyptian.” Levy *ib.* quotes (*inter alia*) Pesikt. r. s. 5 Anf. 7 b, where the Gentiles say to God “Worin bestehen denn deine *Mysterien*?” and God replies “Das ist die Mischna.” There the Heb. seems better represented by “*mysteries*” than by “*mystery*.”

¹ Coloss. ii. 2 εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ. This recognition would not imply exactly “knowing” the mystery. It would be a feeling of approximation like that implied in (Eph. iii. 19) “knowing the love of Christ which passeth knowledge.” There is much to be said also for the reading of W.H. txt and R.V. txt in 1 Cor. ii. 1 τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ.

² Clem. Rom. Cor. § 24.

³ Is. lv. 9—11.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

which, "dry and bare, falling into the earth, dissolve. Then, from the dissolution, the mightiness of the Master's providence raiseth them up" so that "from the one [seed]" they increase manifold and bring forth fruit¹. Origen applies Isaiah's words, "my ways are not as your ways," to prove that "with God, nothing is useless"; even the censers of Corah and his sinful companions are used for God's glory².

Clement's expression about "the seeds dry and bare, falling into the earth" and afterwards "raised up" by the Master, so that each seed brings forth manifold fruit, resembles in thought, though not exactly in word, the Johannine saying about the "grain of wheat," which "except it fall into the earth and die, abideth by itself alone, but if it die it beareth much fruit³." The antithesis to "by itself alone" would naturally be "in company with others." And this gives to the Johannine parable a suggestion of altruism not conveyed by Clement. Clement teaches that each human soul may pass by a resurrection, through death, to a developed and more fruitful existence. But the context in the Fourth Gospel brings out the truth that the death and the increased fruitfulness are to be for the sake of others as well as for the sake of the particular soul that passes through death. The scene in which Jesus enunciates the law of "the grain of wheat" that is to "die" and, by dying, to bear much fruit, contains also, in effect, a prediction of the redemption of the Gentiles (typified by the "Greeks" who come to Jesus); it contains also a recognition,

¹ Clem. Rom. Cor. § 24 ἡ μεγαλειότης τῆς προνοίας τοῦ δεσπότου ἀνίστησιν αὐτά [i.e. τὰ σπέρματα] καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς πλείονα [? σπέρματα ὡς καρπὸν] αὐξεῖ καὶ ἐκφέρει καρπὸν, Lightf. has "and from being one they increase manifold and bear fruit," but adds that αὐξεῖ is treated as a transitive in the Syriac ("The mightiness...increases them").

² Origen Num. Hom. ix. (Lomm. x. 74).

³ Jn xii. 24, where πολὺν καρπὸν φέροι may be compared with Mk iv. 8 ἐδίδου καρπὸν ἀναβαίοντα καὶ πύξανόμενα καὶ ἔφερον. . . , Mt. xiii. 8 ἐδίδου καρπὸν, Lk. viii. 8 φυνὲν ἐποίησεν καρπὸν, Clem. Rom. Cor. § 24 πλείονα αὐξεῖ καὶ ἐκφέρει καρπὸν.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

through a Voice from heaven, that the hour of supreme glory is at hand, in which the Father will be glorified by the death of His Son, not for His own sake but for the sake of others¹. The Marcan word, "mystery," is not mentioned; but the whole of the narrative leads us to "the recognition of the mystery of God, [namely] Christ."

§ 5. "The word," in Mark

Mark mentions "the word" absolutely whereas Matthew and Luke call it, severally, "the word of the kingdom" and "the word of God." But further, Mark introduces his mention of "the word" with a preface uttered by Jesus but omitted by Matthew and Luke: "And he saith unto them, Know ye not this parable? And how [then] will ye come-to-know all the parables? The sower soweth *the word*²."

Comparing Mark with the parallels, we are led to infer that Matthew and Luke did not understand why "this parable" should be singled out as if it contained the key to the explanation of "all the parables." They also thought that "the word" should be defined, and they accordingly define it in phrases apparently intended to signify the proclamation of the Gospel—that is to say, the spoken or written Gospel—but capable also of a wider significance³. Just as a Jewish tradition, quoted above,

¹ Jn xii. 20 foll., concluding with the words (ib. 32—3) "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself. But this he said signifying by what manner of death he was to die."

² Mk iv. 13—14 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Οὐκ οἰδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, καὶ πῶς πᾶσας τὰς παραβολὰς γινώσκεσθε; Ὁ σπείρων τὸν λόγον σπείρει, comp. Mt. xiii. 18—19 αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἀκούσατε τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ σπειρωτοῦ. Παντὺς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας..., Lk. viii. 11 ἔστιν διὰ αὐτῆς ἡ περιβιβλή· Ὁ σπάρων ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.

As regards Matthew's version, "the word of the kingdom," it is worth noting that Matthew uses "kingdom" 56 times, as against 69 in the other three Gospels taken together.

³ Comp. Acts vi. 7 (and xii. 24 "the word of God increased" (R.V. grew) (ἠύξανεν) and multiplied") "And the word of God increased (ἠύξανεν) and the number of the disciples multiplied....," which

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

said that the Mishna was "the mystery" or "mysteries" of God, so Christian tradition toward the end of the first century might begin to narrow down "the word of God" to the word written in the Gospels¹.

Luke's change of "word" into "word of God" may be illustrated by the LXX "*word of the Lord*" substituted for Jeremiah's absolute use of the term: "The prophets shall become wind and *the word* is not in them²." Also, where one Psalm has "The Lord giveth *the word*," the Targum has "The Lord gave *the words of the Law*³," and where another has "He sendeth *his word* and healeth them," the Targum has "He will send *the words of His healing* and will heal them⁴." In all these cases the expansion indicates the natural desire of a later writer to explain an obscurity in an earlier one⁵.

perhaps means that it "increased," like a fire, in intensity as well as in extent.

¹ It was difficult for a Jew to regard "the Law," or "the Word," as a seed that must die and be assimilated in the heart of man. In *Err-Apoc.* ix. 31 foll., when God says "Behold, I sow my Law in you, and it shall bring forth fruit in you," Ezra replies that the Law abides, but Israel has to say "we perish." Ezra has previously (*ib.* viii. 6 Lat.) requested (if the text is correct) "the seed of a [new] heart and cultivation to our perception, whence fruit may spring."

Origen, on the other hand (*Exod. Hom.* i. 4, *Lomm.* ix. 7)—emphasizing the necessity that the "seed," or "word," should die—connects, in a most fanciful but instructive way, (Jn xii. 24) the "death" of the "seed," (Acts vi. 7) the "increase" of the "word," with the "death" of "our Joseph," betrayed "by one of his brothers Juda(s)," followed by (*Exod.* i. 6—7) the "increase" of the children of Israel! Comp. Tertull. *Adv. Jud.* § 10 "Joseph... was sold into Egypt... just as Christ was sold by Israel... when He is betrayed by Judas (*or, Judah*) (*Juda*)."

² Jerem. v. 13.

³ Ps. lxviii. 11.

⁴ Ps. cvii. 20.

⁵ But "the word" might also be omitted by a later writer as being superfluous. For example, where Mark has (iv. 33) "*was speaking... the word*," Matthew (xiii. 34) has simply "*spoke*" (Lk. om.).

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

Mark's use of "the word" is not improbably Petrine. At all events a Petrine speech in the Acts appears to allude to the Psalmist's phrase "He sendeth *his word* and *healeth* them," when Peter says that God "sent *the word* unto the children of Israel, preaching the gospel of peace through Jesus Christ," and adds that Jesus was "anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power," and "went through [the land] doing good and *healing* all that were oppressed by the devil¹." In the Psalm, both Origen and Jerome take "*his word*" as meaning the divine Logos, or Son². In the Acts, it seems to mean, not the Logos, but the effective utterance of the Logos. But the passage is instructive as shewing that "the word" may sometimes be an ambiguous term. It may mean the Principle, or Mystery, of Redemption, the Healing Power, or it may mean the Person exercising that power³.

§ 6. "*The word*," in John, how first mentioned by Jesus⁴

In John, when Jesus uses the term *logos*, it is mostly in such phrases as "my word," or "his [*i.e.* God's] word," or

¹ Acts x. 34—8, Ps. cvii. 20. The text is involved and possibly corrupt, being a Lucan conglomeration of old traditions, but the allusion to the Psalm is manifest.

² Jerome *ad loc.*, and Origen *Cels.* ii. 31.

³ Mk ii. 2 "he was speaking unto them *the word*" (Mt. om.) is parall. to Lk. v. 17 "and *the power of the Lord was toward his healing*," and Luke may have understood "the word" to mean the effective and healing word. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 20 "The kingdom of God is *not in word but in power*," 1 Thess. i. 5 "not in *word only but in power*," Acts iv. 29—30 "grant unto thy servants to *speak thy word* ... while thou stretchest forth thy hand to *heal*."

⁴ Jn iv. 37 *ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ἀληθινὸς ὅτι ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ σπείρων καὶ ἄλλος ὁ θερίζων*. See Joh. Gr. 2799 (iii) "On λόγος (sing. and defined) in Christ's words." Λόγος refers to a passage in the Psalms in Jn xv. 25 "that there might be fulfilled *the word* that is in their own law [there] written that (Ps. xxxv. 19) 'They hated me without a cause.'" Jn x. 35 "If he called them 'gods' unto whom *the word of God* came" refers to Ps. lxxxii. 6. A.V. has "saying," instead of R.V. "word," in Jn viii. 51, 52, 55, xv. 20

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

"the word of God," and nowhere means a mere "saying" of ordinary people. Here, however, both our Versions render it by "saying," "Herein is *the* (A.V. *that*) saying true, One soweth and another reapeth." Perhaps the translators regarded this as a mere popular "saying," beneath the level of a "word" (as used in such phrases as "word of God").

But, if they are right, there are two exceptional points in this sentence. Not only does Jesus use *logos* here to mean a mere "saying," but also the Greek *alēthinos*, which means "real," or "ideal," is here confused with *alēthēs*, which means "true." John uses both words frequently. But *alēthinos* is almost peculiar to him among the evangelists¹, and it implies something quite different from what we call "true" in a true and accurate statement. It means something that is free from all admixture of transient, earthly and corruptible nature. Hence Origen, commenting on Christ as "the *real* (*alēthinon*) light," says "But Christ, being the light of the world, is the *real* (*alēthinon*) light in contrast with the [light] received-by-the-senses, since nothing that is received-by-the-senses is real (*alēthinon*)²."

"keep my word...keep my word...keep his [i.e. God's] word," "if they (have) kept my word."

Apart from Christ's utterances, A.V. has "saying" and R.V. "word," the Gk being λόγος, in Jn iv. 39 "because of *the word* of the woman," vii. 36 "What is this *word* that he said...?" xii. 38 "that *the word* of Isaiah...might be fulfilled," xviii. 9 "that there might be fulfilled *the word* that he spake, namely (*ὅτι*) 'Of those whom thou hast given me I have lost none,'" xviii. 32 "that *the word* of Jesus might be fulfilled which he spake, signifying by what death he should die." R.V. follows A.V. in Jn vi. 60 "this is a hard *saying*" etc.

¹ The only Synoptic instance of ἀληθινός is Lk. xvi. 11 where τὸ ἀληθινόν means "the real and heavenly [treasure]" as opposed to "the mammon of unrighteousness."

² Origen, on Jn i. 9, *Comm. Joann.* i. 24 (Lomm. i. 54) "Ἐστὶ δὲ ὁ Χριστὸς...φῶς ἀληθινόν, πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν αἰσθητοῦ, οὐδενὸς αἰσθητοῦ ὄντος ἀληθινοῦ. He adds "But it does not follow that, because that which

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

This use of *alēthinos* accords with its use in the best Greek authors. For example, when Plato says "not an artificial myth but a *real logos*," he means, not "*a true narrative*"—as though vouching for its complete accuracy—but "*a real history*" as distinguished from a myth¹. Also a second century grammarian has given the title "About *alēthinos logos*" to a treatise on the *logos* regarded as a conception inherent in the soul and not verbally expressed². Hence Westcott, in the Johannine text under consideration, instead of "*is true*," substitutes "*finds its complete, ideal, fulfilment*." With this alteration, the whole passage may be paraphrased thus: "Lift up your eyes from the cornfields on earth to the cornfields in heaven, and see there the spiritual harvest, the harvest of souls, white and ready for reaping. Others have sown, Moses and the Prophets and all the Messengers of God, these have sown, and you have entered into their labours. In this harvest the common proverb—often repeated as a complaint of injustice, namely, that the sower is indeed³ one and the reaper quite another—finds

is received by the senses is not *real* (*ἀληθινόν*), it is consequently false."

Comp. Jn iv. 23 "the real [*and spiritual*] worshippers," vi. 32 "the bread from heaven, the *real* [*and spiritual*] bread," vii. 28 "he that sent me is *real*," viii. 16 "my judgment is *real* [*and spiritual*]," xv. 1 "I am the *real* [*and spiritual*] vine," xvii. 3 "thee, the only *real* God." The last instance is xix. 35 καὶ ἀληθινὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία where the word ought to be rendered consistently with the saying of Origen "*real* in contrast with that which is received by the senses."

John also uses ἀληθής about fourteen times—including the context of the last-quoted sentence—(as against two Synoptic instances) so that we cannot suppose him to be using ἀληθινός where other writers would use ἀληθής.

¹ Plato *Tim.* 26 x.

² Steph. *Thes.* i. 1453 quoting from Hermog. "*De id.* ii. 7: Περὶ ἀληθοῦ λόγου. Init. cap.: ὁ ἐνδιάθετος καὶ ἀληθής καὶ ὅλον ἔμψυχος λόγος."

³ "Indeed" is implied by ἐστίν. It might have been omitted (ἄλλος ὁ σπείρων καὶ ἄλλος ὁ θερίζων). But it is inserted for emphasis.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

its divine fulfilment. For indeed, God, the heavenly Sower, sows, and those men who are most like God, they also sow, that others may reap."

This corrects the erroneous substitution of "true" for "real," but it leaves a possible error in the rendering of *logos* as a mere "saying" or "common-proverb." For the statement that "the common-proverb is a genuine and spiritual common-proverb" is not like the statement "my judgment is a genuine and spiritual judgment¹." A "judgment" can be genuine and heavenly and remain a "judgment," but a "common-proverb" can hardly be heavenly and yet remain what it is. Hence we are led back to doubt whether this exceptional rendering of *logos* in an utterance of Jesus can be correct². And the doubt is confirmed by the fact that some very good authorities take *logos* as meaning "word," and insert the article before *alēthinos*, so that the meaning becomes "Herein is the Word of Truth" or "Herein is the Word that is real [and spiritual]³."

The Word of Truth, in such a context, would seem to be regarded as the Word from above, about which God says, in Isaiah, "As the rain...giveth seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall *my word be*⁴." Irenaeus interprets this as being

¹ Jn viii. 16 ἡ κρίσις ἣ ἐμὴ ἀληθινή ἐστίν.

² Hence I now doubt the complete accuracy of the explanation given in *Joh. Gr.* 2795 "This worldly proverb is 'really and genuinely true' in another interpretation, and that a spiritual one."

³ Jn iv. 37 SS "For in this is the word of truth," δ "in hoc est enim verbum veritatis," D ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος ὁ ἀληθινός, & ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ἀληθινός. B, followed by W.H., has ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ἀληθινός. But the dropping of O in a confused text would be an easy error, which has been shewn (*Joh. Gr.* 2652) to be frequent in B. Chrys. quotes ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ἀληθής and adds "These things the people (οἱ πολλοί) used to say...and [Jesus] says that this saying here especially finds its truth (ὅτι οὗτος ὁ λόγος ἐνταῦθα μάλιστα τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔχει)." Origen *ad loc.* (Lomm. ii. 94—5) (1) quotes as B, (2) has πῶς ἀληθινός ὁ [v. r. om. ὁ] λόγος ἐστὶ, (3) represents Heracleon as apparently quoting ἐν τούτῳ ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος ἀληθινός.

⁴ Comp. Iren. iv. 25. 3 (Jn iv. 37) "In hoc enim, inquit, sermo est verus, quoniam alter quidem est qui seminat populus [i.e. Israel],

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

the Word of the one true God, which came first to Israel the sower, and afterwards to the Christian Church the reaper. But that does not appear to go to the bottom of the meaning of the Johannine saying, which (interpreted as above) teaches us not so much about man's history as about God's nature. It indirectly leads us to recognise, as the Word of Truth, this Law of the heavenly Harvest:—"It is more blessed to give than to receive¹," pointing to the One God, who sows that others may reap, and who is glad that it should be so².

aller qui melet [i.e. the Church], unus autem Deus praestans utrisque quae sunt apta, (Is. lv. 10) *semen quidem seminanti, panem vero ad edendum melenti.*"

¹ Acts xx. 35.

² Space does not allow an examination of Heracleon's comments (possibly corrupt) on Jn iv. 37, about which Origen says "He is not at all clear in his exposition of the nature of the two Sons of Man of whom one sows and the other reaps." The impression left by it is that Heracleon interpreted *logos* as "[divine] word," and not as "[popular] saying."

Origen's introductory remarks about the spiritual harvest in heaven (Jn iv. 35) contain frequent references to the Creation in Genesis, and to the action of the divine Logos and to the several *logoi* of created things (*Comm. Joann.* xiii. 42) *παρεστίν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος σαφηνίζων καὶ φωτίζων πάσας τὰς χώρας τῆς γραφῆς, . . . παρισταμένον τοῦ περὶ ἐκάστου λόγου. . . ἐνείδεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς λόγοις ἐκάστου καὶ εἶδε πῶς καθ' οὗς γέγονεν ἕκαστον τῶν κτισμάτων λόγους ἐστὶ καλόν. . . ὁ λόγος [? ὁ λόγος ὁ] περὶ ἐκάστου τούτων ἐστὶν ὁραθεὶς θεῷ τὸ καλόν. . . Πῶς γὰρ καλὸν τὰ θηρία. . . εἰ μὴ ἄρα ὁ λόγος ὁ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐστὶ τὸ καλόν; . . προτρέποντος τοῦ παρόντος τοῖς μαθηταῖς λόγου τοὺς ἀκροατὰς ἐπαίρειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς. . .*

In the first instance Origen introduces the incarnate Logos of God as enlightening and illuminating all the cornfields of scripture, and in the last as exhorting His hearers to lift up their eyes to the harvest of heaven.

Later on, coming to Jn iv. 37, he says that (*Comm. Joann.* xiii. 47) "whether we take the words in this passage (τὰ κατὰ τὸν τόπον) κατὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν τεχνῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπιστημῶν ληφθῆν παράδειγμα, in that case it is clear how (σαφῆς πῶς) ἀληθινὸς ὁ λόγος (v. i. λόγος) ἐστὶ. . .," or, whether it be taken to refer to Moses and the Prophets, "so too it is clear how one soweth and another reapeth." This favours the view that Origen took *λόγος* to mean "a popular saying," but possibly

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

If John does indeed connect "the *logos* of truth" with "sowing" in the first passage where Jesus mentions the *logos*, the connection affords some grounds for thinking that John had in view the Synoptic Parables of Sowing and especially the tradition peculiar to Mark, "The sower soweth the *logos*." But such an allusion, though not unimportant, is subordinate to the deeper purpose of the Johannine doctrine, namely, to take the term out of a dangerous position where it might be confused with the oral "word" of catechists or the written "word" of evangelists, and to personify it as the Mind or Purpose of the divine Giver of all good. The Evangelist writes as if he knew that the Synoptic Gospels had omitted that saying of Jesus which is almost the only one preserved by Paul, and as if he were determined to inculcate its meaning on his readers: "Jesus said, It is more blessed to give than to receive."

The first Johannine tradition about "giving" follows close after the mention of the Logos as being "with God," and as including "light" and "the life of men." It says "As many as received him, to them he gave authority to become God's children¹." This is the first mention of "*giving*." The next refers to the inferior gift of the Law as compared with the higher gift of grace and truth: "The Law was *given* through Moses, the [gift of] grace and the [gift of] truth came into being through Jesus Christ²." Before this, and after it, the text speaks of an "Only begotten," who is "in the bosom of the Father," and who has "declared" God; and the next mention of God's "*giving*" says "God so loved the world that he *gave* his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on him should

with a play on the meaning. It is difficult to understand how he can call this "clear (*σαφής*)" without any attempt to explain *ἀληθινός*—unless he supposes that he has made it clear by his long previous account of the relation between the *Logos* and the *logoi*.

¹ Jn i. 12.

² Jn i. 17. See also *Joh. Gr.* 2411 c, *Son* 3566.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

not perish but have eternal life¹." Thus the Son dies in the flesh that men should not perish in the spirit. In the language of Isaiah, He "seeth of the travail of His soul and is satisfied²." Or, according to the metaphor of the harvest, the Love of the eternal Sower in heaven sows His Word upon earth, and reaps His harvest from the redeemed souls of men. It is probably not too much to say that when John wrote down "*The Word* was with God" in the first sentence of his Gospel, he had also in mind the thought that "the Sower soweth *the word*," and that he was preparing the way for what he was to write later on: "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die it beareth much fruit... he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal³."

§ 7. "*There is nothing hid save that it should be manifested,*" in Mark⁴

The Parable of the Sower, as explained in Mark and Matthew, concludes with the mention of three classes of fruit-bearers as the result of the seed in the good ground. Luke mentions but one class. If the sowing typifies a spiritual generating of believers, then we may perhaps point to the three stages of belief apparently denoted in the Johannine Epistle, as corresponding to what Luke omits⁵.

¹ Jn i. 14, 18, iii. 16. "Giving" is more frequently mentioned in the Fourth Gospel than in any of the Three, and mostly refers to divine "giving." Mk iv. 25 implies divine giving but does not mention the Giver ("to him shall be given"); Mt. vii. 11, Lk. xi. 13 describe the Father as "giving" severally "good things," or "the Holy Spirit," to those who ask. After Mk ii. 12, Mt. ix. 8, Lk. v. 26 "they glorified God," Mt. alone adds "who had given such power unto men." But no Synoptist approaches John in the emphasis that he lays on giving.

² Is. liii. 11.

³ Jn xii. 24—5.

⁴ Mk iv. 22 οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν κρυπτόν ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ.

⁵ 1 Jn ii. 12 foll.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

After this—which describes the result of the seed that is hidden rightly in the ground—comes a brief parable about a lamp that ought not to be hidden under a bushel; and then Mark adds that “hiding”—that is to say the right kind of hiding—takes place “*with a view to manifestation.*” The disciples are not to hide their light, but to impart it to others. If they do not, they will lose it¹.

¹ The parallel columns given below are printed for the purpose of reference, so that the reader may turn back to them and see the context of the particular expressions discussed in the pages that follow.

Mk iv. 21—5
(R.V.)

(21) And he said unto them, Is the lamp brought to be put under the bushel, or under the bed, [and] not to be put on the stand?

(22) For there is nothing hid, save that it should be manifested; neither was [anything] made secret, but that it should come to light.

(23) If any man hath ears to hear, let him hear.

(24) And he said unto them, Take heed what ye hear: with what measure ye mete it shall be measured unto you: and

Mt. v. 14—16, x. 26,
xi. 15, vii. 2, vi. 33,
xiii. 12 (R.V.)

(v. 14) Ye are the light of the world. A city set on a hill cannot be hid.

(15) Neither do [men] light a lamp, and put it under the bushel, but on the stand; and it shineth unto all that are in the house.

(16) Even so let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

(x. 26) Fear them not therefore: for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known.

(xi. 15) He that hath ears to hear (some anc. auth. omit to hear), let him hear.

(vii. 2) For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye

Lk. viii. 16—17, xiv. 35, viii. 18 a, vi. 38, xii. 31, viii. 18 b
(R.V.)

(viii. 16) And no man, when he hath lighted a lamp, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth it under a bed; but putteth it on a stand, that they which enter in may see the light.

(17) For nothing is hid, that shall not be made manifest; nor [anything] secret, that shall not be known and come to light.

(xiv. 35) ...He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

(viii. 18 a) Take heed therefore how ye hear...

(vi. 38) Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure,

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

It will be seen that Matthew and Luke give quite a different turn to Mark's words as if they meant "There is nothing hidden by man that shall not be revealed in the day of judgment." But that does not appear to be the meaning. Ben Sira (and probably *Aboth*) condemns the teacher that hides his knowledge¹. Philo fiercely attacks the disreputable "initiations" and "mysteries" practised among the Greeks by "three or four" of the initiated "in the dark²." But he praises the "mysteries" implied in the recognition of God, the Father of the Universe, as the Sower of all good³. The same contrast was probably at the bottom of Mark's tradition. But Matthew, transposing the parable of the lamp, appears to have missed the meaning.

Mk iv. 21—5
(R.V.)
contd.

more shall be given unto you.

(25) For he that hath, to him shall be given: and he that hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath.

Mt. v. 14—16, x. 26,
xi. 15, vii. 2, vi. 33,
xiii. 12 (R.V.)
contd.

mete, it shall be measured unto you.

(vi. 33) But seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

(xiii. 12) For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath.

Lk. viii. 16—17, xiv. 35, viii. 18 a, vi. 38, xii. 31, viii. 18 b
(R.V.) *contd.*

pressed down, shaken together, running over, shall they give into your bosom. For with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again.

(xii. 31) Howbeit seek ye his kingdom (*many anc. auth. the kingdom of God*), and these things shall be added unto you.

(viii. 18 b) ...for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he thinketh he hath (*or, seemeth to have*).

¹ Sir. xli. 14—15, rep. xx. 31, comp. iv. 23, *Aboth* i. 14 (see Taylor's note).

² Philo ii. 260.

³ Philo i. 147—8. He appeals to Jeremiah (Jer. iii. 4) as being a *μυστήρ*. See *Light* 3799 b—c which quotes Philo fully on *ὁ σπείρων* and *τὰ λεγὰ ὄντας μυστήρια*.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

And Luke, although he keeps Mark's order, agrees (erroneously) with Matthew in altering Mark's meaning.

So far as "hiding" refers to seed hidden in the ground we may say that John expresses the doctrine, though without the exact word, when he implies that the grain of corn "falls to the ground" and "dies" in order that it may "bear much fruit." There is a doctrine of "hiding," or non-recognition, of a future deliverer of Israel that may be traced in Jewish Apocrypha (based on several Biblical precedents)¹; and this implies a hiding with a view to manifestation. Also in Jewish Haggadic literature that speaks of the rose or lily of Israel among thorns², we find Israel described as "hidden" in, or under, various adversities and oppressions that precede its blossoming. The last of these is Sheol:—"The congregation of Israel crieth before the Eternal, 'Lord of the world, I am *hidden* in the depths of Sheol; but as soon as the Holy One will lead me forth from the abyss of surge and from the depths of Sheol, I will blossom in good works like the lily³.'"

In the Gospels, the doctrine of productive "hiding" is perhaps best illustrated by the "hiding" of the "leaven" in "three measures of meal" mentioned by Matthew and Luke, where the leaven may be said to "die," as leaven, and to live again in the nature of bread⁴. But Epictetus definitely connects

¹ See *Notes 2998* (lv) *d—m* on "The Doctrine of Hiding." Comp. Is. xlix. 1—2.

² Cant. ii. 1—2 "a rose (חבצלת)...a lily among thorns." See Gesen. 287, חבצלת. There is a play on this word and words signifying "love" and "shadow." "Shadow" implies "hiding."

³ *Tehill.* on Ps. i. 4 (Wü. pp. 18—19). Previously Israel is described as "hidden" (1) in the shadow of Egypt, (2) at Sinai (Exod. xix. 17), (3) in the shadow of the conquering Empires.

In the context, the Earth says to the Lord "All the dead of the world are *hidden in my shadow* (Is. xxvi. 19 *my dead bodies shall arise*) and if the Holy One demands them from me, I give them back to Him and blossom like a lily...."

⁴ Mt. xiii. 33, Lk. xiii. 21, on which see *Notes 2998* (lv) *k*. Mt. xiii. 44 says that a man found a treasure "hidden" in some one

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

"hiding" with "sowing" thus: "First make a practice of being ignored as to what you really are. Be philosopher to yourself [*i.e.* give your philosophic lectures to yourself] for a short time. That is the way to produce fruit. The seed, for a time, must be *buried*, must be *hidden*, must grow by little and little, that it may come to perfection¹." That seems to supply the link of thoughts necessary to connect the Synoptic Parables of "sowing" with those of "hiding," and both of them with the Johannine brief Parable—if it may be so called—of the grain of corn falling into the ground and dying.

The preceding observations have not noticed the Synoptic parallels to Mark's tradition about the proper place for "the lamp"—namely, on "the stand," and not under "the bushel" or "the bed²." Referring to those parallels, the reader will perceive that Luke here passes continuously to "the lamp" from the "good ground" in the explanation of the Parable of the Sower, as though there were some connection between them³. Matthew, on the other hand, here proceeds from the Parable of the Sower to "another parable⁴." But in the Sermon on the Mount he adds to the Marcan tradition an interpretation and a moral. The lamp is the disciples ("ye

else's field and "hid" the treasure and bought the field—an action not very satisfactorily explained by Origen and Jerome. Mt. xiii. 33 *ἐκρυψεν* suggests an allusion to Gen. xviii. 6 (LXX) *ἐκρυψας*, on which see Philo i. 173, Clem. Alex. 694, and Origen *ad loc.*

¹ Epict. iv. 8. 35—6 (quoted in *Notes 2998* (lv) f) where *καταφύγειν δὲ* means "must be [as it were] *buried alive*" as freq. in Steph. *Thes.*, and probably in Epict. ii. 22. 10, the only other Epictetian instance.

² Mk iv. 21.

³ Lk. viii. 15—16 "And that in the good ground...these...bring forth fruit with patience. But no one (*οὐδεὶς δὲ*) having lighted a lamp covereth it with a vessel."

⁴ Mt. xiii. 23—4 "...some thirty. Another parable set he forth..." (The Wheat and the Tares).

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

are the light of the world¹"). The moral is "Let your light shine²." Luke elsewhere places another version of the Marcan saying immediately after a denunciation of "this evil generation" as being worse than Nineveh, and before the saying "The lamp of thy body is thine eye³." This saying Matthew places in the Sermon on the Mount after the warning to seek treasure in heaven⁴.

These facts indicate very early differences of tradition as to the meaning and context of "the lamp." The reasons for these there is not space to discuss⁵. But whatever may be the reasons the fact remains that Mark's single mention of "the lamp" is obscure, and that he nowhere supplements it by any doctrine concerning "light⁶." The only instance of the

¹ Mt. v. 14.

² Mt. v. 16—17 "Even so let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven. Think not that I came to destroy the law...."

³ Lk. xi. 32—4 "...a greater than Jonah is here. No one having lighted a lamp putteth it into a cellar or under the bushel but on the stand, that those who enter may see the light. The lamp of thy body is thine eye...."

⁴ Mt. vi. 19—22 "Treasure ye not...for where thy treasure is there will thy heart be also. The lamp of the body is the eye...."

⁵ The regular Heb. for *λύχνος* (first mentioned in Exod. xxv. 37) is *נֵר* but sometimes it is *נֵי* or *נִי*. Now *נֵי* (Ges. 644 b) means "tillable ground." But in Aram. it = "yoke" (Levy Ch. ii. 109 a). Comp. 1 K. xi. 36 "lamp" *נֵי*, LXX *θείσις*, al. ex. *θέλησις*, Aq. Sym. *λύχνος*, Targ. "regnum"; Prov. xxi. 4 "the lamp (marg. the tillage)," Jerem. iv. 3 "break up your fallow ground," Syr. "kindle your lamp." On Numb. xxi. 30 (R.V.) "we have shot at them (*נֵי*)" Onk. has "their kingdom," apparently taking *נֵי* as "yoke" (which Onk. has for Heb. *עֵל* "yoke" in Gen. xxvii. 40 etc.). If Matthew had before him some tradition taking *נֵי* as *עֵי*, "city," it might explain his placing here "a city that is set on a hill cannot be hid."

The Heb. for "lighting" the lamps in Exod. xxv. 37 etc. is *נָתַן*, R.V. txt "light," marg. "set up." This word is rendered in LXX by (a) *ἐρχομαι* in various forms, (b) *καίω*, (c) *ἀπτο* in various forms. These three words are used severally in Mk iv. 21, Mt. v. 15, Lk. viii. 16.

⁶ Mk xiv. 54 "warming himself in the light [of the fire]" is the only instance of *φῶς* in Mark.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

word "light," in Mark, is where Peter warms himself "by the light" of a fire so that he is seen and accused of being a Galilæan, with the result that he denies his Master.

In the Sermon on the Mount, each disciple is regarded as a "lamp," and is exhorted not to let his light be hid. Elsewhere Matthew implies that the "eye," not the disciple, is a "lamp," and in the context the eye is apparently called "the light"; but the metaphors are not clear, and the parallel Luke, though more fully expressed, gives the reader no definite notion of what the "eye" is to see¹. The context in both Gospels, mentioning the "evil," or "wicked," eye in opposition to the "single" one, suggests to us that we are commanded to "see" in a spirit of straightforward kindness and goodness without the obliquity of jealousy and malice. But it does not tell us whether that which we are thus to "see" is in ourselves—as suggested by the Delphian oracle to Socrates "know thyself"—or in all mankind, or in some few, or in the inanimate as well as animate creation².

What course does John take in order to lead us to the understanding of the doctrine latent under Mark's homely

¹ Mt. vi. 22—3 (R.V.)

(22) The lamp of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light.

(23) But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is the darkness!

Lk. xi. 34—6 (R.V.)

(34) The lamp of thy body is thine eye: when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when it is evil, thy body also is full of darkness.

(35) Look therefore whether the light that is in thee be not darkness.

(36) If therefore thy whole body be full of light, having no part dark, it shall be wholly full of light, as when the lamp with its bright shining doth give thee light.

² See Origen *Cels.* vi. 3 replying to a quotation of Celsus from a letter of Plato who writes, that the Supreme Good, *ἐκ πολλῆς συνουσίας γινόμενης περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα αὐτὸ καὶ τοῦ συζῆν ἑξαίφνης, οἷον ἀπὸ πυρὸς πηδίσσαντος ἑξαφθὲν φῶς, ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ γινόμενον αὐτὸ ἑαυτὸ ἤδη τρέφει*. Origen's quotation differs slightly.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

tradition of the lamp under the bushel¹? In the Prologue to his Gospel, he strikes a note accordant with the words of the Psalmist "Thy lovingkindness, O Lord, is in the heavens... the children of men take refuge under the shadow of thy wings...for with thee is the fountain of life, in thy light shall we see light²." Not that John mentions "lovingkindness." That is the outcome, not the outset, of his Gospel, John leads us up to it by introducing the Word, who is "with God," and in whom there is a "life" that is "the light of men," and through whom men receive "authority to become children of God." Whereas Mark speaks of "the lamp" as "coming," John speaks of "the light" as "coming" ("the light that lighteth every man—*coming* [continually] into the world"). But the Prologue goes on to say also that this Word "became flesh" and "tabernacled among us," and it concludes by telling us what men consequently saw and what they did not and could not see: "We beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father.... No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared [him]³."

What John here thus adds does not deny, but supplements, the Synoptic doctrine, and at the same time protects his readers from an error of such "philosophy" as goes hand in hand with "vain deceit⁴." He tells us, in effect, that we are not to think of "the light" as being something of our own to be obtained by self-absorption, by meditating on our own faculties, or by meditating on a God that can be described as Alone. God is revealed to us in the Fourth Gospel as the Father in the beginning, never disconnected from the Son. Later on, the

¹ It may be assumed that this was in the original tradition. Mk iv. 21 *μόδιον* may have been altered by Luke (viii. 16) into *σκήνος*, because of some differences as to the *modius*, the *medimnus*, the *ephah*, and the *seah*. But *modius*, a Hebraized word, is retained in Lk. xi. 33.

² Ps. xxxvi. 5—9.

³ Jn i. 14—18.

⁴ Coloss. ii. 8.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

thought of "the fountain of life" comes before us when we see Jesus sitting by a "fountain" or "spring"—visibly by "the fountain of Jacob," but invisibly by the fountain of life in heaven—and teaching the Samaritan woman the doctrine of "the living water¹." There is no mention of light here, but there is a suggestion that the same Eye of God that "saw" Hagar also "saw" the daughter of Samaria ("He told me all things that ever I did") and that both women received a revelation that was illuminative as well as nutritive².

Thus gradually John leads us up to the proclamation implied but not expressed in the Prologue: "I am *the light of the world*; he that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life³." Even though we may find it impossible to believe that Jesus uttered these identical words, we may be certain that He meant them. The Synoptists themselves represent Jesus as saying that whosoever "received" the Son of Man "received" God. As an inference from this, the reception of the Son of Man as the Light of the World, is regarded in the Fourth Gospel as bringing a higher light and life, making humanity more truly humane, in contrast with that bestial or infra-bestial existence into which it had too often

¹ See *Proclam.* pp. 344—5 "What she calls (Jn iv. 11, 12) 'well' (φρέαρ) the Evangelist calls (Jn iv. 5, 6) 'fountain' (πηγή)." Also Jesus (Jn iv. 14) speaks of πηγή ὕδατος. Comp. Gen. xvi. 7, 14, where what is called at first *Ain*, πηγή, "fountain," is afterwards called by Hagar *Beer*, φρέαρ, "well." Neither of these Hebrew words is the same as that in Ps. xxxvi. 9 (מקור). In LXX, πηγή never = Heb. *Beer*.

² The only Johannine mention of a "lamp" is in a reference to John the Baptist (Jn v. 32—6): "There is another that beareth witness of me, and I know that the witness that he witnesseth of me is true. Ye have sent unto John, and he hath borne witness unto the truth.... He was *the lamp* that burneth and shineth.... But the witness that I have is greater than [that of] John." The "greater" witness is that of the Father, from whom the Son is inseparable. "The lamp" is mentioned by contrast as an inferior thing.

³ Jn viii. 12.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

lapsed. Yet "reception" was only a partial expression of that spiritual metamorphosis. It was not so true to say that men saw or possessed the Light, as to say that the Light entered into and possessed men, regenerating their souls so that from being the children of earth they became children of heaven¹.

§ 8. "He knoweth not how," and "the earth beareth fruit of herself," in Mark²

The parallel columns given below describe a "man" that sows. But in Matthew this is the "householder," that is,

¹ Comp. Plato *Pol.* vi. 509 B τὸν ἥλιον τοῖς ὁρωμένοις οὐ μόνον, αἶμαι, τὴν τοῦ ὁρᾶσθαι δύναμιν παρέχειν φήσεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν γένεσιν καὶ ἀξίαν καὶ τροφήν. The context implies that the sun is regarded as the image or pattern (comp. Plato *Tim.* xviii. 49A μῆγμα δὲ παραδείγματος δεύτερον) of the Supreme Good which is the source of the ideal birth, growth, and sustenance.

This thought of the "sun" as representing the source of birth may throw light on Philo's abrupt transition from Sarah's giving birth to Isaac to "the lamp" in the tabernacle. In the only passage in which Philo's Index refers to Exod. xxv. 31, he writes thus (i. 520) "For she is wont to bring forth children to God alone... For he [Moses] also says that the (lit.) lampstand (λυχνίαν), the archetypal pattern of the imitation (τὸ ἀρχέτυπον τοῦ μιμήματος παράδειγμα) shines on one side, that is the side toward God. For being seventh (ἐβδόμη) and in the midst of the six branches... it sends its rays upward to the ONE (πρὸς τὸ ἓν) thinking its light too brilliant to be met by mortal sight. Wherefore he does not say that Sarah did not bring forth..."

Elsewhere again (ii. 151 ὁ γὰρ ἥλιος, ὡς περ ἡ λυχνία, μέσος τῶν ἐξ τεταγμένων) Philo applies the term λυχνία to the central light. These passages from Plato and Philo shew how, by contrast, Mark's homely metaphor about "the lamp under the bushel," along with Matthew-Luke traditions about "the light of the body," and also with Matthew's *logion* "Ye are the light of the world," when presented to educated readers, might leave them dissatisfied. These Synoptic traditions were true, but they were not the fundamental truth. The truth at the bottom of the Three Gospels was that Jesus Himself brought into the world a regenerating Light, and this latent truth the Fourth Gospel draws to the surface.

² Mk iv. 26—9 (R.V.)

(26) And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed upon the earth;

Mt. xiii. 24—7, 30 (R.V.)

(24) Another parable set he before them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

God. In Mark it is not God, but simply a common human being. That is shewn by Mark's phrase "*he knoweth not how.*" This could not be applied to God or to the Son of Man except by a very forced interpretation¹. Matthew's combination of the Marcan words "*blade*" and "*bud* (R.V. *spring up*)"—uniquely used here in the Gospels—shews that he had before him either Mark or some version of Mark's tradition modified to suit the interpretation of "man" as householder². Luke may have

Mk iv. 26—9 (R.V.)
contd.

(27) And should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up (*βλαστῆ*) and grow, he knoweth not how.

(28) The earth beareth (*or*, yieldeth) fruit of herself; first the blade (*χόρτον*), then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.

(29) But when the fruit is ripe (*or*, alloweth), straightway he putteth forth (*or*, sendeth forth) the sickle, because the harvest is come.

Mt. xiii. 24—7, 30 (R.V.)
contd.

man that sowed good seed in his field:

(25) But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares also among the wheat, and went away.

(26) But when the blade sprang up (*ἐβλάστησεν ὁ χόρτος*), and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also.

(27) And the servants of the householder came.....

(30) Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of the harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather up first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn.

¹ Ephrem Syrus tries indeed to explain it about God thus (p. 126) "*Et quod dicit 'Ipse nescit, quod terra e se ipsa fert fructum,' non ac si ignoraret quod plantavit, sed quia in hoc suo opere non defatigatur.*" He seems to mean that the seed is drawn up by God with such ease and unconsciousness of effort that He may be said "*not to know*" that He is doing it. Pseudo-Jerome says that the man casting the seed is the Son of Man, and that the sleeping of the man is the death of the Saviour: "*Exsurgit semen nocte et die. Post somnum Christi numerus credentium...germinabat in fide et crevit in opere dum nescit ille. Tropica est ista locutio....*" He adds "*nescire nos fecit quis fructum in finem afferat,*" which seems to be another attempt to explain "*he knoweth not.*"

² *βλαστάνω* occurs (in N.T.) only in Mk iv. 27, Mt. xiii. 26, Heb. ix. 4 (of Aaron's rod that budded) and Jas. v. 18 *ἡ γῆ ἐβλάστησεν τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῆς*. *Χόρτος* in the sense of "*blade*" occurs only here, see below, p. 305.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

omitted the whole owing to the doubtfulness of interpretation.

There are several indications that Mark's peculiar Parable is based upon Jewish traditions concerning the first Biblical narrative of sowing: "And Isaac sowed in that land, and found in the same year an hundredfold; and the Lord blessed him, and the man waxed great, and grew more and more until he became very great¹." "The ground was bad," says the Midrash, "and the year was bad"; and indeed the preceding context says that "there was a famine in the land." Yet Isaac "*found*"—not "reaped," says Philo, but "*found*"—a hundredfold. It is implied that the "blessing" did everything; Isaac, who was himself a son (as it were) of the blessing bestowed on Abraham, was blessed by the spontaneousness of the earth in a supernatural way. To Adam it was said "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it...thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee²," but to Isaac we may apply the words of the Psalm "Blessed is every one that feareth the Lord and walketh in his ways, for thou shalt eat the labour of thine hands³."

Passing to the Marcan phrase "*beareth of herself*," literally "*automatically*," we note that "*automatic*" occurs in N.T. only here and in the story describing how the gate of Peter's prison "*automatically* opened⁴." The word "*automatic*" is applied in Greek literature to the earth in the Golden Age bringing forth her fruits of her own accord, and in LXX to the spontaneous fruit that springs up, of its own accord, in the seventh or sabbatical year: "*That-which-groweth-automatically* of thy harvest thou shalt not reap⁵." To this apparently allusion is

¹ Gen. xxvi. 12—13, on which see Philo, the Midrash, Rashi, and Origen.

² Gen. iii. 17—18.

³ Ps. cxxviii. 1—2.

⁴ Acts xii. 10 αὐτομάτῃ [sc. ἡ πύλη] ἡνοιγῇ αὐτοῖς.

⁵ Lev. xxv. 3, 11 Heb. פִּעֵבָה, LXX αὐτόματα ἀναβαίνοντα.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

made in the words of Isaiah, "This shall be the sign unto thee; ye shall eat this year *that-which-groweth-automatically*¹."

Philo connects this Levitical precept (about "that which groweth automatically") with Isaac, as being the type of "the self-taught and self-instructed wise man"—what we should call, "the genius"; and he says "As to those things which we light upon, coming to us *automatically* from Nature, of these we do not find either the beginnings or the ends in ourselves as though we were their causers. The sowing is the beginning, the reaping is the end. But it is better to accept that [saying] 'Every beginning and every end is *automatic*,' [as] equivalent to 'It is Nature's work, not ours².'" Later on, he says that Isaac "'sowed' indeed, setting forth the virtue that is hostile to envy and malice, but is said to have '*found*,' not '*reaped*³,'" apparently meaning that the good seed of kindness not only exterminates the weeds and thorns of envy and malice, but also elicits from the earth a spontaneous and unexpected fruitfulness.

Regarded in this way, the Marcan Parable is an encouragement to the Christian sower to believe that, if he sows the right seed, all things, as Paul says, will "work together for good" for it. He may sleep, he may wake; but whether he sleeps or wakes his work will go on, though "he knoweth not how." Possibly he may die. But, as Origen says, "You will find, even under the Law, martyrs whose fruit was a hundredfold," and Tertullian says "The blood of Christians is seed⁴." The

¹ 2 K. xix. 29 Heb. מִיָּדָה, LXX αὐτόματα, rep. in Is. xxxvii. 30, where, however, LXX has ἀὶσπαρκας but οἱ λοιποὶ have αὐτόματα (or αὐτομάτως). Αὐτόματος does not represent Heb. correctly in Josh. vi. 5, Job xxiv. 24.

² Philo i. 571—2. In οἷς γὰρ ἀπαντοματίζουσιν ἐκ φύσεως ἐπιτυχάζομεν... παρ' ἑαυτοῖς ὡς ἀνατρίους (ed. Richter)—I have assumed that ἀνατρίους is a misprint for ἀν ατρίους.

³ Philo i. 619, quoting Gen. xxvi. 12.

⁴ Origen on Gen. xxvi. 12 (Lomm. viii. 238), Tertull. *Apologet.* § 50. Comp. Pseudo-Jerome on Mk iv. 29 "justi gaudebunt qui 'in lacrymis seminauerunt' (Ps. cxxvi. 5)."

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

martyr after death rests from his labour and "sends in the sickle" that others may reap what he sowed¹; so that, like Isaac, the martyr may be regarded as a type, not only of the Resurrection but also of the sowing of the seed of the Holy Spirit².

John appears to express the automatic nature of spiritual growth in the Dialogue where Jesus says to Nicodemus "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit," and then, "The Spirit *breatheth where it listeth*³." If there is an allusion to "wind" as well as to "Spirit," that makes it all the more certain that the expression implies a spontaneous influence uncontrolled by man, the influence of Nature acting "of herself," that is, automatically. We cannot add, in the same definite way, that the Johannine passage also implies man's ignorance of the nature of the spiritual growth. For the words "*Thou knowest not* whence it cometh and whither it goeth⁴" may possibly be intended to apply to the special ignorance of the Pharisee, Nicodemus. But still the impression left on us by the Fourth Evangelist is that he felt a valuable truth to be contained in the Marcan "he knoweth not how," namely, that every human teacher, every sower of the seed of truth,

¹ Comp. Jn iv. 38 "others have laboured and ye have entered into their labours."

² Comp. Eccles. xi. 5—6 "As thou knowest not what is the way of the wind (*or*, spirit), [nor] how the bones [do grow] in the womb of her that is with child; even so thou knowest not the work of God who doeth all. In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand: for thou knowest not which shall prosper, whether this or that."

On this, *Gen. r.* (on Gen. xxv. 1, Wü. p. 290) says "R. Akiba said 'Hast thou made disciples in thy youth, make them also in thine old age, since thou knowest not in which of them thy teaching will endure'...." It is added that twelve thousand of his earliest disciples died at one time, but at the last there were seven, some of the most famous of all the Rabbis (rep. *ad loc.* on Eccles. xi. 5—6, somewhat differently).

³ Jn iii. 6, 8.

⁴ Jn iii. 8.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

has to sow and then wait—waiting in ignorance of the exact nature of the spiritual agencies that bring the seed to perfection. Those teachers especially need this warning who are proud of their teaching. Jesus addresses it to a teacher of the Pharisees to whom He says, “Art thou *the teacher of Israel* and knowest thou not these things¹?” But the same warning was needed by Christian Pharisees later on², and is needed still.

§ 9. “*Less than all the seeds,*” and “*greater than all the herbs,*” in *Mark and Matthew*³

Luke omits these two phrases. The omission of the former is explicable because the mustard-seed is not “less than all the seeds”; the omission of the latter may be similarly explicable in a writer like Luke, who would not care to commit himself

¹ Jn iii. 10.

² Acts xv. 5 “But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees....” They wished to exclude uncircumcised converts. Peter reminds them of God’s action (*ib.* 8) “giving them the Holy Spirit even as he did unto us.”

³ Mk iv. 30—32
(R.V.)

Mt. xiii. 31—2
(R.V.)

Lk. xiii. 18—19
(R.V.)

(30) And he said, How shall we liken the kingdom of God? or in what parable shall we set it forth?

(31) It is like (*lit.* As unto) a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown upon the earth, though it be less than all the seeds that are upon the earth,

(32) Yet when it is sown, groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches; so that the birds of the heaven can lodge under the shadow thereof.

(31) Another parable set he before them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is like unto a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field:

(32) Which indeed is less than all seeds; but when it is grown, it is greater than the herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the heaven come and lodge in the branches thereof.

(18) He said therefore, Unto what is the kingdom of God like? and whereunto shall I liken it?

(19) It is like unto a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and cast into his own garden; and it grew, and became a tree; and the birds of the heaven lodged in the branches thereof.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

to the assertion that no "herb" grew to a greater height than that of the mustard. Elsewhere, in Matthew, Jesus speaks of the effectiveness of "*faith as a grain of mustard-seed*." This is explained by Origen (obscurely followed by Jerome) as meaning, not "little faith," but "all faith"—called "little" by men of the world, though spiritually great¹. But Clement of Alexandria and Macarius explain it (entirely or partially) as referring to the biting and purifying nature of mustard². The Naassenes and Simon Magus are said to have applied "grain of mustard-seed" to a doctrine of generation "from an indivisible point," from which they drew fanciful and sometimes vicious inferences³. These facts lead us to ask whether John anywhere intervenes by suggesting to us some truth equivalent to the doctrine of "the less" as generating "the greater," here implied by Mark and omitted by Luke.

If there is intervention, it is, as usual, indirect. John never uses the word "little-one," or the adjective "little" in any context (except in the phrase "a little time"), throughout his Gospel⁴. Of course he is obliged to speak of those whom Jesus called His "little ones." But he does it in a way of his own, a way that precludes any materialistic comparison between "little" and "great." The Evangelist first calls them, in the Prologue of his Gospel, "children," saying that the Logos, or Light, "gave authority to become God's *children*" to as many as received Him⁵. Then, at the close of Christ's life on

¹ Mt. xvii. 17—20, on which see Origen (Lomm. iii. 219) and Jerome.

² Clem. Alex. 155, 643—4, 966 (where it is classified with "spark," "pupil of the eye," and "leaven"), Macar. iv. 17 (p. 192).

³ See *Son* 3364 e—f, quoting Hippol. v. 4, vi. 9 and 12, and illustrating from Levy ii. 107a and 176a the Jewish use of "mustard-seed," e.g. "a mustard-seed (*i.e.* drop) of blood."

⁴ He uses *μικρόν* adv. frequently—nine times, against four (*μικρόν* (2), *μετὰ μικρόν* (2)) in the Synoptists—but not *μικρός* (except (Jn vii. 33, xii. 35) with *χρόνος*).

⁵ Jn i. 12.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

earth, he represents Jesus as using to the disciples something like what Origen calls "the language of the nursery," saying "[*Dear*] *little-children*, yet a little while am I with you¹." Jesus here speaks to them in the language of a mother, as Paul does, to his converts, in the Epistle to the Galatians. Later on, changing the metaphor, Jesus says to them "And ye now therefore have sorrow"; and He likens their present sorrow to that of "a woman when she is in travail," and their future joy to that of the same woman rejoicing "for the joy that a man is born into the world"—meaning, apparently, that the "man" Christ, the risen Saviour, shall then be, as Paul says, "[fully] shaped in them²."

This passage detaches us from unprofitable speculations about the precise size and material nature of the mustard-seed, and concentrates our attention on the lesson to be learned from birth and growth. But it adds something of importance. In Mark, the lesson is simply the growth of the great from the little. But when applied to human beings does not this growth often imply pain? A child's body is sometimes said to have "growing pains." And may not a child's mind—and a man's mind as long as he is spiritually an undeveloped child—have its corresponding spiritual "pains"? The ascent through pains of growth to a higher life suggests a thought of Resurrection. Isaiah encourages such a suggestion when he writes "Like as a woman with child, that draweth near the time of

¹ Jn xiii. 33. *Τεκνία*, to which Origen applies the term (Lomm. ii. 474) ὑποκοριστικόν, occurs almost certainly in Gal. iv. 19 *τεκνία* (v. l. τέκνα) μου ὅτε πάλιν ἔδωκα μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, where the language is that of a mother, and freq. in 1 Jn ii. 1 etc. (always pl.). Steph. *Thes.* gives no instance of it earlier than those in N. T. Aristoph. has (*Lysistr.* 889) *τεκνίδιον*, but not *τεκνίον*. It would sound to a Greek probably more homely than "darling," and more like "dearie."

In Jn, Christ's only mention of *τέκνα* is (viii. 39) "if ye are *children* (*τέκνα*) of Abraham."

² Jn xvi. 21—2, Gal. iv. 19.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

her delivery, is in pain and crieth out in her pangs, so have we been in thy presence, O Lord," and then, "Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is [as] the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth the dead¹."

In Isaiah, instead of "herbs," many authorities here substitute "illuminations," and LXX goes quite astray. We cannot therefore suppose that the Marcan Parable of the uprising of the mustard-seed to be the greatest of "herbs" originally alluded to this passage of Isaiah, and was typical of the Resurrection as well as of the spread of the Gospel. But we may feel fairly confident that the Fourth Evangelist had in his mind this passage of Isaiah as a type of various kinds of resurrection. If that was so, the poetry of the Hebrew "dew of herbs" might naturally be contrasted in his mind with prosaic Christian discussions about the mustard-seed as "greater than the herbs." This would confirm him in his purpose to subordinate the *size* of the growth (from "little" to "great") and to emphasize its regenerating *nature*, according to the words of the Psalmist "In the beauties of holiness, from the womb of the morning, thou hast the dew of thy youth.... Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek²." At all events the fact remains that the Fourth Gospel never mentions Christ's "little-ones," but does mention "children of God," and those whom Jesus Himself calls His "[dear] little children³."

¹ Is. xxvi. 17—19, R.V. marg. "dew of light," and so Targum. Ibn Ezra places this interpretation before "herbs." Rashi mentions only "herbs."

² Ps. cx. 3—4.

³ Specimens were given above (p. 30, notes 2, 3) of Jewish doctrine about mystical "hiding," called "hiding *in the shadow*." It is worth noting that Mark describes the mustard-seed, which itself has been first hidden in the ground, as putting forth such branches that the birds of the air "find lodging *under its shadow*" (Mt. and Lk. "in its branches").

Also Lk.'s substitution of (xiii. 19) "his own garden" for (Mt.)

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

§ 10. Private "expounding," in Mark¹

Matthew omits two Marcan statements, 1st, that Jesus adapted His parables to the ability of His hearers, 2nd, that He used afterwards to explain² all things privately to His own disciples. Luke omits the whole. The versions of Mark vary, and an ancient comment on Mark says that Jesus explained only *all those parables about which He was questioned*³. "Expounded *all things*" might well seem incompatible with subsequent statements about the blindness of the disciples to some of the truths taught them by Jesus. Matthew's parallel

"his field" (Mk has "the earth") may have been partly due to a desire to shew that the seed here mentioned was not of corn but of something select and separate. Comp. Is. lxi. 11 "As the earth bringeth forth her bud, and as the *garden* causeth to bud her *sowing*, so the Lord will cause to bud righteousness..." on which Gesen. 283 a refers only to Lev. xi. 37, explained by Rashi from Dan. i. 12 (comp. i. 16) "*sowings* to eat," R.V. "*pulse*," marg. "*herbs*," Theod. "*seeds*," LXX *σπέρμιν* (of which Steph. *Thes.* gives Galen's interpretation as "any seeds from which bread is not made").

¹ Mk iv. 33—4 (R.V.)

(33) And with many such parables spake (ἐλάλει) he the word unto them, as they were able to hear it:

(34) And without a parable spake (ἐλάλει) he not unto them: but privately to his own disciples he expounded (ἐπελυσεν) all things.

Mt. xiii. 34—5 (R.V.)

(34) All these things spake (ἐλάλησεν) Jesus in parables unto the multitudes; and without a parable spake (ἐλάλει) he nothing unto them:

(35) That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by (or, through) the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things hidden from the foundation of the world (*many anc. auth. omit* of the world).

² By the imperfect ἐπελυσεν, "used to explain" or "proceeded to explain," and by "privately," an interval is implied between the utterance, and the explanation, of the parable.

³ Cramer, on Mk iv. 34, "Let us understand '*expounded all things*' [to mean] that [He expounded] *all things as many as they sought to understand from Him*, as [for example] the parable of the seed and that of the tares. For the rest He left uninterpreted, having said to them, (Mt. xiii. 51) Have ye understood all these things? They said, Yea, Lord."

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

statement that Jesus was fulfilling the words of the Psalmist, "I will utter things hidden from the foundation of the world¹," gives us the impression that he may mean, by "things hidden," something corresponding to "the word" in Mark. But there is nothing in Matthew parallel to the Marcan "expounding."

We must return to the question, touched on above, "When did Jesus 'expound' these parables?" Here, ancient commentators give little or no light. Origen, it is true, twice or thrice quotes the Marcan tradition². But he couples his first quotation with a statement that Jesus appeared with a different appearance to the multitudes from that which He assumed to His disciples, at all events to "the eyes of their soul," and, in his opinion, "also to the eyes of their body³." This gives no indication as to the interval between the parables and the "expounding." It would be compatible with the view that the "expounding," at all events in some cases, did not take place till after Christ's resurrection.

¹ Mt. xiii. 35, comp. Ps. lxxviii. 2.

² The quotation is undoubted where he uses the Marcan *ἐπιλύω*, not used elsewhere in the Gospels, *Cels.* ii. 64, iii. 46. It is also probable in *Cels.* vi. 6 *ὅτι μὲν ἐλάλει τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς κατ' ἰδίαν, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν ταῖς ἀναχωρήσεσιν, εἴρηται· τίνα δ' ἦν ἃ ἔλεγεν, οὐκ ἀναγίγραπται.*

³ *Cels.* ii. 64 Ἀλλὰ καὶ εἴπερ "κατ' ἰδίαν τοῖς ἰδίους μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυε" τὰς παραβολὰς...ὥσπερ ταῖς ἀκοαῖς ἦσαν κρείττους...οὕτω καὶ ταῖς ὕψεσι πάντως μὲν τῆς ψυχῆς, ἐγὼ δ' ἡγοῦμαι, ὅτι καὶ τοῦ σώματος. In T. and T. Clark's translation, this is not printed as a quotation from Mark. In Lommatsch it is printed as from Mt. xiii. 10, 11, seqq. In *Cels.* iii. 46 "κατ' ἰδίαν γὰρ τοῖς ἰδίους μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν ἅπαντα" ὁ Ἰησοῦς—as also in Philocal. § 18 (Lomm. xxv. 120)—Lomm. prints the words as from Mark, but T. and T. Clark's transl. does not. Mk iv. 34 is apparently referred to in *Clement. Hom.* xix. 20 (ed. Clark, "He explained to His disciples privately the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven") in connection with an alleged saying of Jesus "Keep the mysteries for me and the sons of my house," but I have found no other early reference except perhaps Tertull. *De Praescript.* § 20. In the Index to Jerome's *Letters* (transl. Fremantle) p. 468 "Mark iv. 34" is an error for ix. 34.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

Startling as this may be, it is certainly the conclusion to which John leads us—and that, in more ways than one. First, negatively, though he often represents Jesus as speaking in private to His disciples, he never represents Him as explaining to them in private what He had said to others in public. Secondly, he represents Jesus as saying "I have spoken openly to the world; I ever taught in synagogue, and in the temple, where all the Jews come together; and in secret spake I nothing¹." Thirdly, he represents Jesus as having taught what would be called the essential "mystery" of the Christian religion—the doctrine of His flesh and blood as the food of the world—publicly in the synagogue of Capernaum². Fourthly, he calls the Parable of the Good Shepherd a "proverb"—that is (apparently) a dark saying, "not understood" by those to whom it was addressed³. Subsequently Jesus is represented as telling His disciples in effect (though they almost refuse to believe it) that all His past teaching has been "dark sayings" to them, and must be so till He sends the Holy Spirit or Paraclete to explain their meaning⁴.

Let us suppose that John is here intervening to explain the meaning of the Marcan tradition transmuted by Matthew and rejected by Luke. In that case his view would seem to be to this effect: "Mark is referring here to Christ's method of teaching as a whole. It was not intended to hide mysteries from the multitudes outside the circle, or 'house' (as the Jews call it) of His disciples, and to reveal them immediately afterwards in that 'house⁵.' It was the desire of Jesus to prepare all for the knowledge of '*the word*' as far as possible, that is, '*even as*

¹ Jn xviii. 20, see *Joh. Voc.* 1694 b.

² Jn vi. 59.

³ Jn x. 6. By "understood" John means "morally understood." Every man "understands" what "a shepherd" means; but no self-absorbed man "understands" what "the good shepherd" means. To the Pharisees (Westcott *ad loc.*) "the spiritual conceptions of the fold, the door, the sheep, the shepherd, were all strange."

⁴ Jn xvi. 25 foll.

⁵ On "house," see *Son* 3460 c.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

they were able to hear [and understand].' But they were able to go but a little way, even the most zealous of the hearers, in understanding. As long as He was in the flesh with them, *He did not, [and could not] speak to them without a parable.* But afterwards *in private*, in the days that followed His resurrection, to *His own [true] disciples He expounded all things¹.*"

If all this seems to us indefinite, circuitous, and historically unsatisfying, perhaps the reason is that we attach more importance than the Fourth Evangelist did to believing definite historical statements about the words and deeds of the incarnate and the risen Saviour, apart from the spirit in which we believe them. It seems clear from the whole tenor of the Johannine Gospel and Epistle that the author cannot conceive of a soul as being really Christian unless it permanently possesses, and is possessed by, the quickening and instructing Spirit of the ever-living Christ. A book that strives to impart to its readers the conception of the influence of such a Life and such a Spirit may well be regarded by many as less definite, direct, and satisfying than a history (like Luke's) that devotes itself to "tracing the course of all things accurately from the first²."

¹ If that is the historical fact, we must suppose that Mk iv. 10 "*quite-alone* (κατὰ μόνας)" has a special significance. In N.T. it does not occur elsewhere except Lk. ix. 18 ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας συνῆσαν (marg. συνήνητησαν) αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί where Mk-Mt. mentions (Mk viii. 27, Mt. xvi. 13) "Caesarea Philippi." Καταμόνας does not occur in Goodspeed's Concordances except *Hermas Mand.* xi. 8 οὐδὲ καταμόνας λαλεῖ Lat. *secrete* (but ? by himself, apart from God's help). The *Pistis Sophia*, after much discourse (1—4) about the "mystery" that is "the head of all things" and "surrounds (or, explores) the universe," says (4) "the disciples were sitting by themselves on the mount of Olives" and Jesus "sat at a little distance from them (sedit remotus ab iis paululum" (rep. 5). Presently He comes to them and says (9) "From this day I will speak with you openly (ἐν παρήρσι) from the beginning of the truth even to the end thereof, and I will speak with you face to face without parable." Comp. Acts i. 6—12 which describes the disciples as questioning Jesus on the Mount of Olives.

² Lk. i. 3.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

But if we are wise we shall accept the Fourth Gospel as wholesomely supplementing the Third. And we may do well to ask ourselves whether this "unsatisfying" writer might not say to us "The Church is in danger of being too easily satisfied by books. I would have my readers rise from their reading unsatisfied, and desiring something that can be given them by no book, but only by the Saviour Himself¹."

§ II. "*The word,*" in the Fourth Gospel as a whole

Reviewing the preceding sections we find much to justify the conclusion that John's interventions in favour of Mark—as in the phrases "he knoweth not how," and "hidden that it may be revealed," and "to you is given the mystery"—are part of a general attempt to shew that the divine Logos, or Word, is to be distinguished not only from the mere intellectual Logos that would be connected by Greeks with "logic," but also from Scripture on the one side and Voice on the other², and that it is to be regarded as "sown," or incarnate in humanity, in order to produce Love, the Love of the Son of Man. In Christ's first mention of the Logos we have seen reason for supposing that this mystery is suggested: "Herein is the Word of Truth (*or*, the Word ideally true) that one soweth and another reapeth," that is to say, God "sows" His Word and man reaps salvation³.

¹ Comp. Jn xxi. 25.

² Comp. Papias, in Euseb. iii. 39. 4, on the importance he attached to "what comes from living voice," τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς as compared with τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων. He does not mention Scripture. On the other hand, Irenaeus iii. 2. 1 describes heretics as objecting to N.T. taken by itself, on the ground that "it was not delivered by [written] letters but *through living voice* (per vivam vocem)." John (xxi. 25) speaks of "books" as an inadequate representation of Christ's actions. He also represents the Baptist as saying (i. 23) "I am [but] the voice of one crying...", that is, in effect, "I am *only a voice*, not the Word."

³ See § 6 above.

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

In the expression of this doctrine, and more particularly in the marked distinction between "real" and "true" (*alēthinos* and *alēthēs*), John may have been influenced by Greek philosophy. Epictetus ascribes to the *logos* a cleansing power. The Gods, he says, are "clean by nature," and men, so far as they draw nigh to the Gods in accordance with the *logos*, grasp that which is clean and that which is cleansing (*or*, cleanly). "But since it is impossible that their substance should be entirely clean, being blended of such matter (*hylē*) [as is inherent in it], the *logos*, received from [the Gods by men] attempts to make this [substance] cleanly as far as possible¹." No doubt Epictetus implied that there is to be in this "cleansing" some infusion of love, good will, and respect for one's fellow creatures. But he does not say so here; and it is significant that in the whole of the Dissertations the word "good-will" occurs only incidentally².

The Fourth Evangelist also represents the *logos* as "cleansing." But in how different a form! And with an appeal to motives how different! He represents Jesus, on the last night of His intercourse with His disciples, as washing their feet like a servant, and as saying to them, some time afterwards, "Already are ye clean because of the *logos* that I have spoken

¹ Epict. iv. 11. 3—4 *ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι φύσει καθαροὶ καὶ ἀκῆρατοι, ἐφ' ὧσον ἡγγίκασιν αὐτοῖς οἱ ἄνθρωποι κατὰ τὸν λόγον, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον καὶ τοῦ καθαροῦ καὶ τοῦ καθαρίου εἶσιν ἀνθεκτικοί. ἐπεὶ δ' ἀμύχανον τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτῶν παντάπασιν εἶναι καθάραν ἐκ τοιαύτης ὕλης κεκραμένην, ὁ λόγος παραληφθεὶς εἰς τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον ταύτην καθάριον ἀποτελεῖν πειράται.*

² The only mention of *eunoia* is in iv. 1. 22 "he asks for a sword, and is angry with the man who, out of good will, refuses it." But it occurs also in the Fragments ed. Schenkel, pp. 472, 480. *Φιλία* occurs more frequently, and there is a passionate detestation (ii. 4. 3) of the selfish licentiousness that destroys neighbourhood, friendship and citizenship; but the treatise on *φιλία* shews that the philosopher's main thought is of that which is (ii. 22. 20) "profitable (*συνοίσει*)" to himself, that is to his true Self, the Man within him (as opposed to the Beast).

THE PARABLES OF SOWING

to you; abide in me, and I too in you¹." Herein Jesus is referring to what He had said immediately after the washing, "Ye are *clean*, but not all²"—"not all," because Judas had not "received the *logos*" into himself. As soon as Judas goes out of the chamber, Jesus promulgates the New Commandment: "*A new commandment* I give unto you, that ye love one another³."

Few, very few, are the commandments or precepts that Jesus gives to His disciples in the Fourth Gospel. In Matthew and Luke they abound. In Mark they are perhaps not more than a dozen. But in John the precepts of Jesus to the Disciples, up to the night of the Last Discourse, are not more than three: (1) "Lift up your eyes," (2) "Make the people sit down," (3) "Gather up the fragments⁴." It is perhaps not an accident that the Fourth Gospel represents Jesus as giving to the Twelve, up to the time of the Washing of the Feet, no precepts at all except such as concerned them, either (1) as reapers of the spiritual harvest, or (2) as preparers of the people for the reception of the spiritual bread, or (3) as recipients (in full measure) of bread for themselves in return for the bread given to others.

¹ Jn xv. 3—4.

² Jn xiii. 10.

³ Jn xiii. 34.

⁴ Jn iv. 35, vi. 10, 12. Some might add, as being at all events an imperative, Jn xii. 7 *ἀφες*. But this is in the singular; and the context, mentioning Judas by name, suggests that Judas is addressed. The above remarks refer to precepts addressed to *more disciples than one*.

CHAPTER II

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

[Mark iv. 35—41]

§ I. *Why does John omit this?*

WE now come to a point where criticism, if it is to be practised at all, will have to include minute verbal analysis, a close study of words and minute phrases, as well as an attempt to re-imagine (as it were) the mingled reminiscences and imaginations of the Galilaean fishermen who formed an important part in the circle of Christ's disciples, and who, after His resurrection, sang songs of praise and adoration to their Lord in heaven while waiting day by day till He should return to them on earth.

An instance of such minute verbal analysis was given in a previous volume where it was shewn¹ that a single Greek word used by Luke pointed to early divergent interpretations of one of what we might call the Gennesaret-traditions. Luke represented Peter in a fishing-boat as "*making signs*" to his partners in another fishing-boat to come and help him, in consequence of a miraculous draught of fishes so vast that the boats were "*beginning to sink*".² It was shewn that the Greek word *kateneusa* used by Luke did not elsewhere mean "*made signs*" (though it might mean "*made a sign of assent*") but that

¹ *Proclamation* pp. 91—7.

² Lk. v. 7 ὥστε βυθίζεσθαι αὐτά. Βυθίζομαι does not occur in canon. LXX. Goodspeed gives it only in Clem. Rom. Cor. § 51 of the Egyptians in the Red Sea. Βύθος in canon. LXX refers almost always to the Red Sea, or metaph. to the "sinking" or "drowning" of the soul. Βυθίζω, in N.T. elsewhere, occurs only in 1 Tim. vi. 9 of spiritual "drowning."

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

it did sometimes mean "*swam to [shore].*" Now John does, in effect, describe Peter as *swimming to shore*, toward Jesus, from a fishing-boat on Gennesaret, after Christ's resurrection. Hence it was inferred that John regarded Luke as having misinterpreted and placed before the Resurrection an event that he should have placed after it.

These facts, though discussed under the Calling of the Fishermen, will demand some attention later on when we are confronted with the question why, and with what differences, John describes the Walking on the Sea, which Mark and Matthew insert but which Luke omits. For we must there note that in that description Matthew inserts an account of Peter's coming to Jesus across the sea and "*beginning to be drowned*¹." This John omits, presumably regarding it, like Luke's version, as erroneous and antedated.

The object of these remarks is to bespeak more than usual patience for the study of some details in the Stilling of the Storm, on the ground that, in such a narrative, even a single word or phrase may have a meaning not visible on the surface and not fully intelligible till we perceive that it refers to a post-resurrectional period.

It will be convenient to dwell separately on the traditions peculiar to Mark in the parallel texts as given below. Putting aside unimportant verbal differences, and also the exorcistic address to the sea ("Be silent, be thou muzzled") which is alien from the Fourth Gospel², we find the following three:

¹ Mt. xiv. 30 ἀρξάμενος καταποντίζεσθαι (not elsewhere in N.T. except Mt. xviii. 6 implying condemnation). In LXX, once of the Red Sea, elsewhere always metaphorical.

² Mk iv. 39 Σιώπα, πεφίμωσο. Comp. Mk i. 25, Lk. iv. 35, where "Be thou muzzled" is used exorcistically. John, later on, speaks of "*a great wind that blew,*" vi. 18 ἡ τε θάλασσα ἀνέμου μεγάλου πνέοντος διηγγίετο (as Ak etc.). "*Great wind*" (of which three instances are mentioned in Lev. x. on Lev. xiii. 2) suggests God as the Sender in the case of Jonah (i. 4). The other instances are Job i. 19 ("there came a great wind") where Satan is apparently

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

(1) "they take him [*i.e.* Jesus], as he was, in the boat," (2) "and other boats were with him," (3) "he was in the stern on the cushion¹."

permitted to send it, and 1 K. xix. 11 where the Lord apparently sends it, but "the Lord was not in the wind."

¹ Mk iv. 35—41
(R.V.)

Mt. viii. 18, 23—7
(R.V.)

Lk. viii. 22—5
(R.V.)

(35) And on that day, when even was come, he saith unto them, Let us go over unto the other side.

(36) And leaving the multitude, they take him with them, even as he was, in the boat. And other boats were with him.

(37) And there ariseth a great storm of wind, and the waves beat into the boat, insomuch that the boat was now filling.

(38) And he himself was in the stern, asleep on the cushion: and they awake him, and say unto him, Master (*or*, Teacher) (*διδάσκαλε*), carest thou not that we perish?

(39) And he awoke, and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, Peace, be still. And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm.

(40) And he said unto them, Why are ye fearful? have ye not yet faith?

(41) And they feared exceedingly, and said one to another, Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?

(18) Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about him, he gave commandment to depart unto the other side.

.....
(23) And when he was entered into a boat, his disciples followed him.

(24) And behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, insomuch that the boat was covered with the waves: but he was asleep.

(25) And they came to him, and awoke him, saying, Save, Lord, we perish.

(26) And he saith unto them, Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith? Then he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm.

(27) And the men marvelled, saying, What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?

(22) Now it came to pass on one of those days, that he entered into a boat, himself and his disciples; and he said unto them, Let us go over unto the other side of the lake: and they launched forth.

(23) But as they sailed he fell asleep: and there came down a storm of wind on the lake; and they were filling [with water], and were in jeopardy.

(24) And they came to him, and awoke him, saying, Master, master, (*ἐπιστάτα*), we perish. And he awoke, and rebuked the wind, and the raging of the water: and they ceased, and there was a calm.

(25) And he said unto them, Where is your faith? And being afraid they marvelled, saying one to another, Who then is this, that he commandeth even the winds and the water, and they obey him?

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

§ 2. (R.V.) "*They take him with them, even as he was, in the boat,*" in Mark¹

No explanation of "even as he was" is alleged from any early commentator. Euthymius paraphrases it, "as He was sitting in the boat." This is said to mean that Jesus was "already on board—a point which Matthew and Luke overlook—and He now put to sea without going ashore to make preparations²." But (1) there is no other instance in which the disciples are said to "take" Jesus "with them" in this literal sense; (2) the divergences of Matthew and Luke indicate that they dissented from the Marcan tradition; (3) the Diatessaron omits the Marcan clause, though inserting the Marcan words that precede and that follow; (4) an ancient commentator on Mark reads "*He took them with him,*" and explains why He did it, namely, that He might "*make them witnesses*" of the miracle that was to follow³.

The precise meaning of the Marcan word is "*take, or receive, from.*" Applied to things, it is often used of "*receiving [tradition] from*" a teacher. Applied to persons, it may mean "*receiving [children] from [parents]*" with a view to instruction, but it also means, generally, "*taking charge of,*" "*taking into one's own circle,*" "*taking as a companion*⁴." In LXX it is used of Abraham, Laban, Joseph etc. "*taking, from [one place to another],*" servants, or friends, to accompany them on some journey or business⁵. In the Synoptic Gospels, it is frequently

¹ Mk iv. 36 παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῇ πλοίῳ.

² So Prof. Swete quoting Euthymius, and adding "In the Gospels the word is commonly used of the Lord 'taking' the Twelve, e.g. ix. 2, x. 32, xiv. 33, cf. Jo. xiv. 3; but here the disciples, as owners and navigators of the boat, 'take' Him with them."

³ Cramer *ad loc.* He uses first ἔλαβε and then παρέλαβε, thus: τοὺς μὲν οὖν μαθητὰς μετ' ἑαυτοῦ ἔλαβεν... παρέλαβε δὲ οὐ μάρτην οὐδὲ εἰκῆ, ἀλλ' ὥστε ποιῆσαι θεατὰς τοῦ μέλλοντος ἵσσεσθαι θαύματος....

⁴ See Steph. *Thes.* παραλαμβάνω.

⁵ See LXX *Oxf. Concordance*, παραλαμβάνω.

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

used of Jesus taking all, or some, of the Twelve apart, as companions. But it is never thus used by John. His three instances of it are (1) (narrative) "He [*i.e.* the Logos] came unto his own and his own *received* him not," (2) (Jesus to the disciples) "If I go and prepare a place for you, I come again and will *receive* you unto myself," (3) (narrative) "Then therefore he [*i.e.* Pilate] delivered him unto them [*i.e.* the Jews] to be crucified. They therefore *received* Jesus¹."

As to this last, it is worth noting that the only Synoptic instances of "*receiving Jesus*" are in Matthew's accounts of the Temptation and the Passion. In the former, there is some obscurity since the devil is twice described as "*receiving*" Jesus². Origen, in a comment on Satan and the "*delivering up*," or *paradosis*, of Jesus, after saying that the Father "*delivered up* the Son, as in the case of Job, to the opposing powers," says that "it was to the destruction of their own kingdom and dominion, contrary to their expectation, that they *received* the Son from the Father³." In the account of the Passion Matthew says "Then the soldiers of the governor *received Jesus* [from Pilate and took him] into the praetorium⁴." It is perhaps not without a touch of Johannine irony that John begins his Gospel by saying that when the incarnate Logos came to "his own"—*i.e.* to the Jews—from God, "his own *received him not*," but when He was delivered to them *by Pilate*, then "they *received him*."

¹ Jn i. 11, xiv. 3, xix. 16—17.

² Mt. iv. 5 R.V. "*Taketh* (παλαμθάνει) him into the holy city," A.V. "*taketh him up*," rep. *ib.* 8. Luke avoids the difficult word, having ἀνάγειν and ἄγειν. Origen (Lomm. xxi. 511, rep. xxv. 21) uses ἀναβιβάζοντος, perhaps blending (see context) Luke and Matthew.

³ Origen *Comm. Matth.* xiii. 8, 9 εἰς κατάνυσιν τῆς ἰδίας βασιλείας καὶ ἀρχῆς παρὰ προσδοκίαν παραλαβόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν υἱόν.

⁴ Mt. xxvii. 27 τότε οἱ στρατιῶται τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, παραλαβόντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον.... The other Synoptists do not use the word in describing the Passion. See *Joh. Gr.* 2570 *d* quoting *Evangel. Petr.* § 1 καὶ τότε κελεύει Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς παραλαβόντας τὸν Κύριον.

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

The Pauline Epistles say (1) "As therefore ye *received Christ Jesus the Lord*, [so] walk in him," (2) "*Having received* from us the word of hearing [*i.e.* the word of the Gospel] [which is the word] of God, ye welcomed [it] not [as the] word of men, but—even as it truly is—[the] word of God, which also inwardly-worketh in you that believe," (3) (in a passage where "*learn Christ*" means in effect "*receive Christ*") "Ye did not so *learn Christ*, if so be that ye have heard him, and were taught in him, even as truth is in Jesus¹." All these imply that we are, in some spiritual sense, to "*receive Jesus as He is*," not merely to *receive words about Jesus*. The phrase "*as He is*" may be illustrated from the Johannine Epistle, which uses it of the ultimate revelation for which men may hope: "We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him, for we shall see him *even as he is*²."

In the Walking on the Sea, it is said by John alone, "They therefore desired to *take* (or, *receive*) him into the boat³." John here uses the uncompounded form "*take*" (not "*take-from*"). No doubt there is a difference between the two, as may be seen from his Prologue, where he uses the compounded along with the uncompounded form, thus: "He [*i.e.* the Logos, or the Son] came unto his own, and his own did not *receive him from* [*the Father*]; but, as many as *received him*, to them gave he authority to become children of God⁴." In the Prologue, the meaning perhaps is that, "when the Son of God came to His own family, none *received Him* [*filly as coming*] *from* [*the Father*], but some *received Him* [*though imperfectly*]⁵." So here, on the hypothesis that the Johannine clause ("they desired to receive him into the boat") is to be taken

¹ Coloss. ii. 6, 1 Thess. ii. 13, Eph. iv. 20, 21.

² 1 Jn iii. 2 *καθώς ἐστιν*.

³ Jn vi. 21 *ἤθελον οὖν λαβεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον*.

⁴ Jn i. 11—12 *παρελάβον... ἔλαβον*.

⁵ Quoted from *Joh. Gr.* 2570, where see the difference between *λαμβάνω* and *παραλαμβάνω*, illustrated from Epictetus.

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

metaphorically, we may suppose that some clause of this kind in the original tradition referred to the spiritual "reception" of Jesus after the Resurrection, when He returned to them across the waters of Sheol, and when they recognised that He was no "phantasm" or "bodiless spirit" or "demon," but their true Lord, so that they "received Him as He was,"—though (even now) imperfectly, because the Holy Spirit had not yet descended¹.

Of course to modern readers all this seems extremely fanciful. But we should put ourselves in the position of the Galilaean fishermen during that night of despair when their Master—as they afterwards believed and as the Christian Creeds teach us still to believe—actually passed across the Sea of Death in order to "preach to the spirits in prison." Then we ought to attempt to realise something of the nature of those songs which Paul and Silas sang in the dungeon of Philippi and which Christians must have sung from the beginning of the Gospel that they preached in His name. Thus, and only thus, shall we be prepared to do justice to the supposition that these narratives of what happened on the Sea of Galilee are described in language originally used in Songs of Resurrection.

¹ "Phantasm," in N.T., occurs only in Mk vi. 49, Mt. xiv. 26 (the Walking on the Sea) where SS has "devil," and in Lk. xxiv. 37 (D) (the Resurrection) "they thought they saw a spirit (πνεῦμα) (D φάντασμα)." Ignatius has (Smyrn. § 3) "For I know that also after the resurrection...when He came to Peter and his friends [i.e. to those around Peter], He said to them, *Take* (or, *receive*) (λάβετε), handle me, and see (ἴδετε) that I am not a bodiless demon (δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον)." Lk. xxiv. 37—8 adds that the disciples were "terrified and full-of-fear (ἡμφοβοί)" and that Jesus said to them "Why are ye troubled (ταραγμένοι)?" Comp. μὴ φοβείσθε in Mk vi. 50, Mt. xiv. 27, Jn vi. 20 and ἐταράχθησαν in Mk vi. 50, Mt. xiv. 26 (Jn vi. 19 ἐφοβήθησαν). The Johannine account of the Resurrection makes no mention of "fear" except in Jn xx. 19 "the doors being shut where the disciples were for fear of the Jews, there came Jesus and stood in the midst...."

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

It is not proof, but only supposition—supposition, however, derived from many lines of evidence pointing to one conclusion. It must be reserved for later occasions—when we come to discuss the Walking on the Sea and the Resurrection—to collect in detail the evidence for the hypothesis that the Resurrection is the historical fact, on which are based the two earlier narratives of Mark-Matthew (one omitted by John and one by Luke) which are of the nature of poetry. The phrase “of the nature of poetry” (not “poetry”) is intended to leave us free to believe that there may have been some actual scenes of storm on Lake Gennesaret, which, after Christ’s resurrection, were recorded in Galilaean poetry as being typical of that which came to pass later on when Christ “fell asleep¹.” If the hypothesis had not been stated here, the reader might have complained that, in dealing with the phrase “they took him with them even as he was,” we had passed over an instance of the failure of the rule of Johannine Intervention. We maintain on the contrary that it will be found to be an instance not of failure, but of fulfilment, if the reader will keep his mind open for the evidence as a whole.

¹ Compare Origen *Cant. Hom.* ii. 9 (Lomm. xiv. 272—3) “To this day in the faithless, and in those of doubtful heart, the divine Word sleeps...sleeps in those who are tossed by storm-waves.... Straightway comes a calm when He awakes (eo vigilante). Straightway all the mighty masses of waters become still; all the opposing spirits (or, winds) (spiritibus) are rebuked; the rage of the waves is silent. While He sleeps, there is storm, death, and despair.” Origen also expressly accepts the narrative in its literal sense as well as spiritually (Lomm. v. 269—70): “Although at all times, when He is awakened (excitatur) by disciples, He restrains the whirlwinds or storm-blasts of the Church, yet it is certain that also at the time the events recorded in the history actually took place (tamen certum est etiam tunc gesta esse ea quae per historiam referuntur).”

Origen’s words are capable of a partial illustration from a poetical conception of the Saviour’s Descent into Sheol. When Jesus fell asleep on earth, the opposing spirits raged in exultation. When He passed into Sheol and led captivity captive, they were rebuked and became silent.

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

§ 3. "And other boats were with him," in Mark¹

The text in Mark varies. Several MSS or versions insert "many" and omit "other²"; or insert "but" as well as "and³"; or omit "boats," or substitute "little boats⁴"; or have "with them" for "with him⁵." Codex D, instead of *ploia*, "boats," has, apparently under an erasure, a feminine form *ploiai*, non-existent in Greek⁶. It is possible to explain the variations as to "other" and "but" from a passage about "boats" in John where Nonnus and Chrysostom take the Greek to mean "other boats," but R.V. and W.H. take it as "but boats⁷." The Greek, in ancient MSS which are unaccented, may mean either "other" or "but," so that the Greek MSS are of no interpretatory value on this point.

This Johannine passage has an obvious bearing on our

¹ Mk iv. 36 καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ, om. in parall. Mt.-Lk.

² Confusion has arisen owing to the ambiguity of ἄλλα meaning (1) "but" (adversative), (2) "other." Those who took it to mean "other" might add δὲ meaning "but" (supplementary). See below. Codex b inserts "simul" as well as "multae": "et multae naves simul erant cum illo," codex e ("many persons") has "et simul multi erant cum eo."

³ See Swete *ad loc.*

⁴ See Swete as to "little boats (πλοῖα)," but add that codex e has "many [persons]," and that codex b has, first, "navicula" ("in the little-boat"), and then "naves" ("many boats").

⁵ So Syr. in Walton "naviculae autem aliae cum eis erant."

⁶ Mk iv. 36 καὶ ἄλλαι δὲ πλοῖαι πολλαὶ ἦσαν, consistently making the adj. ἄλλος feminine pl. and the verb ἦσαν pl. instead of singular.

⁷ Jn vi. 23 (W.H.) ἀλλὰ ἦλθεν πλοῖα. Probably the harshness of "other boats came"—without "but" or "and" to introduce the clause—has induced W.H. to accent ἄλλα as "but." This harshness (doubtless) explains why many authorities insert δὲ. Alford reads ἄλλα [δὲ] ἦλθεν πλοῖα. Blass rewrites the text as ἐνέβησαν εἰς πλοῖα ἐπελθόντα ἐκ Τιβεριάδος. But if that had been the original, why should scribes have altered a sentence so simple and easy? The chaotic condition of the text in Jn vi. 23 (for which see Blass *ad loc.*) is best explained as an attempt of John to clarify an old Marcan tradition about ἄλλα πλοῖα.

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

Marcan tradition about "*other boats*." And if *alla*, "*but*," were placed before the Greek *ploia*, it might be read as *all'aploia*. Now *aploia* means "*weather not fit for sailing*." That might seem appropriate in Mark: "Jesus was already in the boat, desirous to depart, *but the weather was not fit for sailing*." Moreover the word *aploia* had a kind of literary history which would make it specially appropriate at the outset of a narrative that was to suggest to Christians a thought of their Lord as being in the circumstances of Jonah, yet rising superior to them. For *aploia* in Herodotus, Æschylus, and Euripides, means *unfavourable winds sent by the Gods and propitiated by human sacrifice*¹. It was known to all the world that the Greek fleet sailing for Troy had been detained at Aulis till Iphigenia had been offered up as a sacrifice to Artemis. It was also known to all Jews that Jonah had been, in a manner different but somewhat similar, cast into the deep at his own request, for the sake of the safety of his companions.

The word is not alleged to occur in later Greek². We should therefore note the use of it in the Dissertations of Epictetus, where he says that, instead of concentrating ourselves on one thing alone—namely, our mind—we foolishly attach ourselves to external things: "For this cause, if there be *foul-weather* (*aploia*) we sit, distracted, and peering constantly 'What wind is it?' we say, 'Boreas? What do we want with Boreas? When will Zephyrus blow?'" The philosopher replies to the distracted man "When Zephyrus pleases, my good

¹ See ἀπλοια in Herod. ii. 119 (pl.) and Aesch. *Ag.* 150 (Dindorf) (pl.); also sing. in Aesch. *Ag.* 188, Eurip. *Iph. Aul.* 88, *Iph. Taur.* 15. Plutarch *Mor.* 857 B is quoting Herodotus, though loosely. In all these cases, human sacrifice is the result, resorted to in order to terminate ἀπλοια.

² It is not in the Concordances to Aristophanes, Aristotle, Demosthenes, nor in the Index to Lucian, nor in the Indices to Berlin Urkunde and Egypt Papyri (Sept. 1915). In Plutarch it occurs merely as part of a free quotation from Herodotus.

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

friend, or when Æolus pleases. For the Gods did not make you steward of the winds, but Æolus¹."

Whatever may be the explanation of the variations in the MSS they indicate that the phrase caused difficulty in early times; and the Johannine clause and its variations, when compared with the Marcan clause and its variations, appear to constitute an instance of Johannine Intervention. This increases the probability that as to the Marcan clause in the context, discussed in the last section ("they took, *or*, received, him"), John has again intervened; for an intervention that is only slightly probable as to a particular text becomes more probable if we can shew that the writer intervened as to the context².

§ 4. "On the cushion," in Mark³

No satisfactory evidence has been hitherto produced that "*the cushion*," in a literal sense, was "a regular part of the boat's

¹ Epict. i. 1. 16. Ἀπλοια occurs nowhere else in Epictetus. The text varies. Might Epictetus here be jibing against the Christian representation of Jesus as Æolus and reproducing some version of the tradition about ἀπλοια? Or might the scribe of D be influenced by traditions about the ἀπλοια that befell Jonah?

² Whatever uncertainty may attend the explanation of this Johannine parenthesis about ΑΛΛΑΠΤΑΟΙΑ, one conclusion is fairly certain, that it does not proceed from the Evangelist's invention. And this is important because of the great number of Johannine parentheses (see *Joh. Gr. Index "Parenthesis"*). Some of these suggest, at first sight, that the Gospel has been "worked over" by an editor, with doctrinal bias, who has not always taken the trouble to fill the gaps between the evangelic text and the editorial interpolations. But the clause under consideration, when studied along with Mark, does not favour the hypothesis of an editor adding anything of his own invention. It rather favours the hypothesis of an evangelist or sub-evangelist, inserting an ancient explanation, for which he did not consider himself responsible.

³ Mk iv. 38 ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων. D omits τὸ. Instead of "*prümpe* (stern)," codex *e* has "*priora*," apparently for "*prora*," followed by "super pulvinum dormiens." An ancient commentary says "Mark has also told us how He slept, namely, that

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

equipment¹." Codex Bezae alters "*the cushion*" into "*a cushion*." But how came "*the*" into the Greek text? And why do the parallel Matthew and Luke avoid the word altogether instead of adopting this simple alteration? These questions call for an answer, and at the same time, although John omits the whole of this narrative, we are bound to ask, in accordance with our rule, whether he has anything that bears on the Marcan word.

In the first place we must note that the Greek for "cushion" is literally "head-rest," or "pillow," and that it is only occasionally and irregularly used for a rower's cushion. In the next place, the Syriac Thesaurus has a form of the word "pillow" not only in Mark but also in John, "She saw two angels in white sitting, one *at the pillow*, and one at the feet, where the body of Jesus had been put²." Then, looking into the Scriptural Hebrew that corresponds to the Syriac "pillow,"

it was *ἐν προσκεφαλαίῳ*, plainly shewing His simplicity (*ἀνυφον*).³ I do not understand the force of *ἐν*, if it is deliberately substituted for *ἐπὶ*.

¹ Concerning the *προσκεφάλαιον*, Theophylact (writing about A.D. 1071) says *ξύλων δὲ πάντως ἦν τοῦτο*. But it is not shewn by competent evidence that in boats on the Sea of Galilee or elsewhere there existed a structure of this kind that was called "*the head-rest*," τὸ *προσκεφάλαιον*. On the other hand Steph. *Thes.* illustrates the use of *προσκεφάλαιον* for *ὑπηρέσιον* ("rower's cushion") and quotes Lysias p. 121, 36 *προσκεφάλαια εἰς τὴν ταφὴν* as shewing that the word was applied to a part of funeral clothing. The evidence of Macgregor (*Rob Roy on the Jordan*, 4th ed. p. 321) begs the question ("evidently a regular part of the boat's equipment, from the use of the definite article") and is of no value.

² Jn xx. 12. So Walton. *Thes. Syr.* 293 has "cervical" here and in Gen. xxxviii. (error for xxviii.) 11, 18, 1 S. xix. 13, xxvi. 12, etc., and adds that in the place of the sing. (which is non-existent) there is used in Mk iv. 38 a shortened form with a prefix. Castell 173 renders the Chaldaic in O.T. and the Syr. in Jn xx. 12 by "cervical." SS for Mk is wanting; for Jn it is rendered (Burk.) "one *at the head of the place*"—Walton, "unum *a cervicali*"—"that Jesus had been lying in and one at the feet."

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

we see that it is a plural noun meaning "*place at the head*" or "*head-place*," but it is rendered by A.V. "*pillows*" in Genesis, and "*bolster*" in Samuel, and by A.V. marg. and R.V. "*head-tires*" in Jeremiah¹. This indicates that a word rendered in Mark's version of the Stilling of the Storm "*pillow*" or "*cushion*," may have been rendered in a Johannine narrative of the Resurrection "*the place at the head*," but it would not shew, or even suggest, that John was alluding to Mark, unless other evidence of allusion were produced.

The only instance of the Marcan word "*pillow*" in the canonical LXX corresponds to a form of a Hebrew word meaning "*cover*," so that it might naturally mean "*covering*" or "*veil*," and Origen (followed by Jerome) takes it as a woman's veil thrown over the face of a man—a thing that ought not to be². Now John, in the same narrative in which he mentions Mary as seeing an angel "*at the head* (Syr. *head-place*, or *pillow*)," mentions also Peter, a little before, as seeing "*the napkin that had been on his head...³*." This is not the place to discuss what Origen calls the "*tropology*⁴"—that is to say mystical metaphor—of all these Johannine details, which suggest the thought of Jesus bound and veiled in the grave by well-meaning Jewish friends, but released and glorified in the Resurrection. All that we can say here is, first, that we ought not to conclude at present that John has *not* intervened as to

¹ Gesen. 912 quoting Gen. xxviii. 11, 18 etc. and Jerem. xiii. 18 (where Gesen. proposes to read "from your heads").

² Ezek. xiii. 18—20 (*bis*). See Origen on Ezek. xiii. 18 (Lomm. xiv. 43—5) "Si quis vero confusionis velamen gerit et peccati, iste quasi muliebria velamina habet super caput suum."

³ Jn xx. 7 "the napkin that had been on his head...apart, wrapped up (lit.) *into one place*"—a rare phrase (Gesen. 880 a) suggesting that the napkin was rolled away like the waters (Gen. i. 9, comp. Ps. civ. 8—9) that once veiled the face of the earth.

⁴ Origen *Cels.* v. 56 δηλωτικόν τινος εἶναι τροπολογίας τῆς περὶ τῶν προφαινομένων τοῖς τὴν ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Λόγου θεωρεῖν παρεσκευασμένοις.

THE STILLING OF THE STORM

this particular Marcan phrase until we have weighed the cumulative evidence for such intervention as a whole; secondly, that these "Gennesaret-traditions" lend themselves to variety of interpretation and chronological arrangement; thirdly, that if John has intervened, the intervention may be illustrated by his description of Peter as swimming from his boat to the Lord, whereas Luke describes him as in a boat that is "beginning to sink," and Matthew as himself "beginning to be drowned."

CHAPTER III

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

[Mark v. 1—20]

§ I. *Reasons for discussing this narrative*

IT was necessary to print the narratives given below, for the sake of completeness, in order that the reader might feel that no facts are kept back from him that are unfavourable to the theory of Johannine Intervention¹. But at first sight no

¹ Mk v. 1—20
(R.V.)

(1) And they came to the other side of the sea, into the country of the Gerasenes.

(2) And when he was come out of the boat, straightway there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit,

(3) Who had his dwelling in the tombs: and no man could any more bind him, no, not with a chain;

(4) Because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been rent asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: and no man had strength to tame him.

Mt. viii. 28—34
(R.V.)

(28) And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gadarenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming forth out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man could pass by that way.

Lk. viii. 26—39
(R.V.)

(26) And they arrived at the country of the Gerasenes (*v. s.* Gergesenes, *or*, Gadarenes) which is over against Galilee.

(27) And when he was come forth upon the land, there met him a certain man out of the city, who had devils; and for a long time he had worn no clothes, and abode not in [any] house, but in the tombs.

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

comment appeared to be needed except that John records no exorcisms, and that the Synoptic narratives contain nothing

Mk v. 1—20
(R.V.) *contd.*

(5) And always, night and day, in the tombs and in the mountains, he was crying out, and cutting himself with stones.

(6) And when he saw Jesus from afar, he ran and worshipped him;

(7) And crying out with a loud voice, he saith, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God? I adjure thee by God, torment me not.

(8) For he said unto him, Come forth, thou unclean spirit, out of the man.

(9) And he asked him, What is thy name? And he saith unto him, My name is Legion; for we are many.

(10) And he besought him much that he would not send them away out of the country.

(11) Now there was there on the mountain side a great herd of swine feeding.

Mt. viii. 28—34
(R.V.) *contd.*

(29) And behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?

(30) Now there was afar off from them a herd of many swine feeding.

(31) And the devils

Lk. viii. 26—39
(R.V.) *contd.*

(28) And when he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God? I beseech thee, torment me not.

(29) For he commanded the unclean spirit to come out from the man. For oftentimes (*or*, of a long time) (*πολλοῖς χρόνοις*) it had seized him: and he was kept under guard, and bound with chains and fetters; and breaking the bands asunder, he was driven of the devil into the deserts.

(30) And Jesus asked him, What is thy name? And he said, Legion; for many devils were entered into him.

(31) And they intreated him that he would not command them to depart into the abyss.

(32) Now there was there a herd of many swine feeding on the mountain: and they intreated

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

that, either in word or thought, could claim to belong to the Fourfold Gospel. On closer examination, however, there

Mk v. 1—20
(R.V.) *contd.*

(12) And they besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them.

(13) And he gave them leave. And the unclean spirits came out, and entered into the swine: and the herd rushed down the steep into the sea, [in number] about two thousand; and they were choked in the sea.

(14) And they that fed them fled, and told it in the city, and in the country. And they came to see what it was that had come to pass.

(15) And they come to Jesus, and behold him that was possessed with devils sitting, clothed and in his right mind, [even] him that had the legion: and they were afraid.

(16) And they that saw it declared unto them how it befell him that was possessed with devils, and concerning the swine.

(17) And they began to beseech him to depart from their borders.

(18) And as he was entering into the boat, he that had been possessed with devils besought him

Mt. viii. 28—34
(R.V.) *contd.*

(*lit. demons*) (*δαίμονες*) besought him, saying, If thou cast us out, send us away into the herd of swine.

(32) And he said unto them, Go. And they came out, and went into the swine: and behold, the whole herd rushed down the steep into the sea, and perished in the waters.

(33) And they that fed them fled, and went away into the city, and told everything, and what was befallen to them that were possessed with devils.

(34) And behold, all the city came out to meet Jesus:

and when they saw him, they besought [him] that he would depart from their borders.

Lk. viii. 26—39
(R.V.) *contd.*

him that he would give them leave to enter into them. And he gave them leave.

(33) And the devils came out from the man, and entered into the swine: and the herd rushed down the steep into the lake, and were choked.

(34) And when they that fed them saw what had come to pass, they fled, and told it in the city and in the country.

(35) And they went out to see what had come to pass; and they came to Jesus, and found the man, from whom the devils were gone out, sitting, clothed and in his right mind, at the feet of Jesus: and they were afraid.

(36) And they that saw it told them how he that was possessed with devils was made whole (*or, saved*) (*ἰσωθῆναι*).

(37) And all the people of the country of the Gerasenes (*v. r. Gergesenes, or, Gadarenes*) round about asked him to depart from them; for they were holden with great fear: and he entered into a boat, and returned.

(38) But the man from whom the devils

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

appeared to be one point that might repay investigation, a point common to all the Synoptists, the mention of "*the tombs*."

"In the tombs," in John, is connected with the future resurrection of the dead: "The hour cometh in which *all that are in the tombs* shall hear his [*i.e.* the Son of man's] voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done ill, unto the resurrection of judgment¹." "*Tombs*," in the plural, is of rare occurrence in the New Testament; and "*out of the tombs*"—apart from Mark-Matthew here—occurs nowhere else except where Matthew mentions a resurrection of the saints following immediately on Christ's death: "And *the tombs* were opened; and many bodies

Mk v. 1—20
(R.V.) *contd.*

that he might be with him.

(19) And he suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go to thy house unto thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and [how] he had mercy on thee.

(20) And he went his way, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him: and all men did marvel.

Mt. viii. 28—34
(R.V.)

Lk. viii. 26—39
(R.V.) *contd.*

were gone out prayed him that he might be with him: but he sent him away, saying,

(39) Return to thy house, and declare how great things God hath done for thee. And he went his way, publishing throughout the whole city how great things Jesus had done for him.

¹ Jn v. 28—9 *οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις*. Mk v. 3, 5, Lk. viii. 27 have *ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν*. Mk v. 2, Mt. viii. 28 have *ἐκ τῶν μνημείων*. Sometimes such a variation might point to a difference of documentary origin. Matthew and John, who severally use *μνημείον* about seven and sixteen times, never use *μνῆμα*. Mark and Luke use both. Comp. Xen. *Hellen.* iii. 2. 15 *ἐκ τοῦ ἀντιπέντας . . . ἐπὶ τῶν μνημάτων . . . εἰς τὰ παρ' ἁντοῖς μνημεῖα καὶ τύψεις τινας*, where "*the tombs* [in the distance] over against them" are mentioned first, and then "*the memorials* and various kinds of tower-shaped structures on their own side."

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised; and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection, they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many¹." Origen, commenting on this passage, which he illustrates from John, takes Matthew in a spiritual as well as a literal sense. Both passages might be regarded as predicting, or describing, the Preaching of Christ to the spirits in prison, which was believed to have taken place during the "three days" that followed His death².

The question arises whether "in the tombs" may have had originally a similar significance. Several facts brought forward in our last Chapter pointed to the conclusion that the Stilling of the Storm, whatever may have been its basis in literal fact, was primarily a spiritual poem describing the condition of the disciples tossed in tempests of doubt during the "three days" that followed Christ's death. Now we have to consider whether the sequel in Mark may contain another version of what happened during those "three days." If it does, then according to this second version, Jesus was not, as in the first version, "sleeping on the pillow." He had passed across the waters of Sheol to the land of "tombs," the prison-house of the dead. In that case, who is it that comes out from the tombs to meet Jesus? Is it "two" demoniacs as Matthew says? Or is it "one," as Mark and Luke say, but one possessed by "many" devils? And is there any explanation of the fact that the Mark-Luke term "legion" is omitted by Matthew? And is there any connection between "*two*," used by Matthew alone to describe the two demoniacs, and "*two thousand*," used

¹ Mt. xxvii. 52—3.

² See Lightfoot's numerous quotations on Ign. *Magn.* § 9. Add Origen *Comm. Matth.* on Mt. xxvii. 52—3 (Lomm. v. 70) and *Evang. Petr.* § 10. The latter describes Christ as being carried up to heaven from the tomb in the sight of the soldiers, while the Cross follows: "They heard a voice from heaven saying, 'Hast thou preached to them that are sleeping?' And an answer was heard from the Cross, 'Yea.'"

THE DEMONIAC AND THE SWINE

by Mark alone to denote the number of a herd of swine apparently corresponding to the number of a legion?

§ 2. "*Gerasenes*," "*Gadarenes*," or "*Gergesenes*"¹

Reviewing the questions that conclude the preceding section, the reader may perhaps ask why the first place was not given to a question about the scene of the miracle. According to R.V., it is called by Mark and Luke's text "the country of the *Gerasenes*"; by Matthew, "that of the *Gadarenes*"; but Luke's margin has "*Gergesenes*" or "*Gadarenes*." Why do we not ask first of all "What was the name of the place?"

The answer is "Because it is impossible to ascertain the fact." Even in Origen's time there was uncertainty owing to variations of readings in MSS as well as differences between the Gospels. And Origen gives us a clue to the explanation of these variations when he says that the names of the places where Jesus wrought mighty works are "*eponymous*," that is to say, named in accordance with the works². He himself favours the name "*Gergesenes*," which he explains as if it were two words, "the sojourning of those-who-cast-out." One might have supposed that if the word was derived from "cast-out," the "casting out" would be the act of Jesus "casting out" the devils. But Origen refers it to the inhabitants, as if they were, in effect, "casting out" Jesus when they "besought" or "asked" Him to depart from their borders³. Jerome in his

¹ Mk v. 1, Mt. viii. 28, Lk. viii. 26.

² Origen *Comm. Joann.* x. 10 (Lomm. i. 295) ἴσμεν γὰρ καὶ τόπων ὀνόματα ἐπώνυμα τυγχάνοντα τοῖς κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πράγμασιν. His meaning—strange though it may seem—must be that these ancient names were prophetically appropriate to the future Messianic actions. Clark renders it "We know that the names of places agree in their meaning with the things connected with Jesus."

³ Mk v. 17 ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν, Mt. viii. 34 παρακάλεσαν ὅπως μεταβῇ ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν, Lk. viii. 37 καὶ ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὅπως τὸ πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασσηνῶν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν. R.V. renders παρακαλεῖν here "beseech," but in Lk. iii. 18 (of John the Baptist) "exhortations," and similarly in Acts ii. 40

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

commentary on Matthew takes no notice of the differences of name in Gospels or MSS and gives no interpretation to the form ("Gerasenes") which he adopts.

The name "Gadarenes" might be regarded by some as "eponymous," because it was connected with "fold," "flock," "herd," so that it might refer to the swine¹. "Gerasenes" might refer to the "casting out" of the demons². "Gergesenes" might be derived from "the ancient Canaanite stock of the *Gergashites*, or from the word *Gargushta*, which signifies *clay* or *dirt*³."

This last explanation is not so improbable as it at first sight seems. Daniel, speaking of the resurrection, says, according to the literal Hebrew, "Many of them that sleep in the *ground of the dust* shall awake"; but Theodotion has "in the *heaped-up-dust* (or, *mound*) of the *earth* (or, *land*)," using a word (*chōma*) that is often used to mean a "hillock-tomb" or "cairn," but also means a "mound" of any kind⁴. Now this word *chōma* occurs in the whole of the early Fathers and Apologists *only once, in the following charge against the Jews brought by Justin Martyr*: "And from the words of the aforesaid Jeremiah they have likewise cut out this, 'But the Lord God remembered His dead [that were from] Israel that had fallen asleep in[to] the *earth* (or, *land*) of the *heaped-up-dust*, and came down to proclaim unto them His salvation⁵.'" This saying is

(of Peter preaching) etc. Comp. Rom. xii. 8 ὁ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει, "he that exhorteth in his exhortation." It would be appropriate to Christ "exhorting" the spirits imprisoned in Hades.

¹ Ἀγέλη is used here by all the Synoptists to represent "herd." Comp. 1 S. xxiv. 3 (4) "*enclosures* (ἀγέλας) of the flocks," Heb. g[e]dērah.

² See Gesen. 176 b on gārash "cast out."

³ Hor. Heb. on Mt. viii. 28.

⁴ Dan. xii. 2 (Theod.) ἐν γῆς χώματι.

⁵ Justin Mart. Tryph. § 72, Ἐμνήσθη δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χώματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀναγγεῖλαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ. Perhaps we ought to read τῶν

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

repeatedly quoted by Irenaeus as from Jeremiah or Isaiah. The Greek is wanting; but the Latin renderings of "*the earth of the heaped-up-dust*" are "*terra*" with "*sepultionis*," "*defossionis*," "*sepelitionis*," but once with "*limi*," "*mud*¹."

This brings us round to the suggestion of *Horae Hebraicae*, agreeing with that of Origen as to the name, though not as to the interpretation. The word *Gargushta*, "*clay*," "*dirt*," or "*clod*," which is frequently used in the Targums, occurs pertinently in the Targumistic rendering of Job's aspirations for a resurrection, "*My body is clothed with worms and with clods (gargushta) of dust*²." This lends itself to a symbolism like that of Origen, not unknown also in Greek as well as Hebrew literature, "*The bodies of sinful souls, that is, souls dead unto God, are called 'tombs*³."

These Gergesenes may have been regarded in some Christian poetry as "*clods*⁴." But this would not exclude a different class of metaphors, in which they may be regarded as bound in the prison-house in chains of their own sinful desires, or else enslaved by Satan and Death.

ἀπὸ Ἰσραήλ. Otto, in his long and valuable note, omits to mention that Justin reproduces Dan. Theod. ἐν γῆς χώματι in εἰς γῆν χώματος. I dare say subsequent editors have supplied this omission.

¹ Iren. iii. 20. 4, iv. 22. 1 [iv. 33. 1, incomplete], iv. 33. 12 ("*limi*"), v. 31. 1. It is probable that this quotation came to Irenaeus from several authors of early date.

² Job vii. 5 quoted in Levy *Ch.* i. 152—3, with other instances.

³ Origen on Mt. xxvii. 51—3 (Lomm. v. 70). See Steph. *Thes.* on σποῖς and τύμβος. Mk v. 5 "*in the tombs and in the mountains*" may be compared with Is. xiv. 19 "*from thy sepulchre*," ἐν τοῖς δρεσιν. See *Clue 148 a* quoting Taylor's conj. σποῖς for δρεσιν. Another explanation would be that χώμα was sometimes interpreted as "*hill*."

⁴ George Fox, in his *Diary*, describes himself as sitting among a dead congregation, round a dead preacher, and seeing them revealed to him as "*clods*."

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

§ 3. "Two" demoniacs in Matthew, and "two thousand" swine in Mark¹

There are other instances where Matthew, differing from the other Synoptists, mentions "two²." But those (which will be discussed in their order) will be found to differ from the present. Here, the parallel Mark mentions "two," but in a different context ("about *two thousand*," referring to the swine "choked" in the sea); and the conduct of the "two" in Matthew is quite different from that of the "one" in Mark-Luke. The "two," instead of being bound in chains (as Mark and Luke say), practically bar the way themselves against all passers-by. They are "exceeding fierce (*or*, terrible) so that no man was strong enough to pass along through that way³." In ancient poetical descriptions of Jesus descending to Hell to rescue the imprisoned spirits, a mention of "two fierce demons" would be suitable in the scene where Satan goes forth outside to meet Jesus, while Hades says to his demons "Shut the gates (*or*, the cruel gates) of brass,...and resist bravely, that we, holding captivity, may not be taken captive⁴." Macarius says that the "two" mentioned by Matthew were "exarchs," that is chiefs, of demons⁵. One word for "chief" or "captain" in Hebrew is closely similar to the Hebrew for "thousand⁶." Hence "chief" might be taken as "thousand," or as "chief of a

¹ Mt. viii. 28, Mk v. 13.

² Mt. ix. 27, xxvi. 60.

³ Mt. viii. 28. Χαλεπός, "fierce," applied to persons, occurs in the whole of the Greek Bible (including Apocrypha) nowhere else except Is. xviii. 2 (Heb.) "terrible." It is applied by Homer to a δαίμων in *Od.* xix. 201, and to hard, cruel, persons as well as things, in Greek literature.

⁴ Comp. *Descens. ad Inf.* § 5 (21) (Tisch. p. 376) reading "captivemur" for "captivemus." For traditions about the "Descent" see above, p. 70, n. 2.

⁵ Macar. ed. Blondel, p. 76.

⁶ See Gesen. pp. 48—9, מֵאָה "thousand," מְלִיךָ "chief," "chiliarch."

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

*thousand*¹." Thus an original "*two leaders*" referring to Satan and Hades might be taken by Mark to mean "*two leaders of thousands*," so that the total number of their host was "two thousand."

That Mark is wrong appears probable from the fact that he himself represents the demoniac as saying "My name is Legion, because we are many." Now a legion, in imperial times, would number six thousand or even more, and probably never so few as two thousand.

§ 4. Why does Matthew omit "legion"?

If Matthew's original regarded the two demoniacs as demon "princes" or "chiefs," they could not say, "We are many," but only "We have many under our command." In Jewish tradition, the Latin word "Legion," transliterated as a Jewish word, meant *either* "legion" or "commander of a legion." Matthew appears to have taken it in the latter sense. We have seen that he applies the rare epithet "*hard*" (meaning "cruel") to his two demoniacs. The same epithet, in Hebrew, is repeatedly applied to "the commander of a legion".

In the light of these facts, it is possible to explain Mark's additions, as attempts to combine two quite different pictures. One is that of Christ, confronted by Satan and Hades, two "chiefs" of Hell, who bar its doors and draw fast its chains to prevent His ingress and the release of their captives. From this, Mark borrows the "chains," but he applies them to the demoniac, who (according to Mark) has been chained for his

¹ See Zech. ix. 7, xii. 5, 6 where "leader" is rendered χιλιάρχος, "leader of a thousand."

² Levy ii. 474 b "zwei strenge Feldherren (oder: Leibgarden)... jenen strengen Feldherren," Levy Ch. i. 403 a "dieser Befehlshaber ist streng." In all these cases the noun is "legion" (meaning "legionary commander") and the adj. is the Heb. word for (Gesen. 904) "*hard*," "*severe*," "*fierce*"—exactly corresponding to the Greek χαλεπός.

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

own benefit and has broken the chains to his own injury. Mark also borrows "*two chiefs*." But he takes it as meaning *two thousand*, and as implying that the demoniak, though but one, was possessed by two thousand devils, who pass into swine of a corresponding number ("*two thousand swine*").

Another picture is that of Israel in Egypt, the captive nation "bound" in the "misery and iron" of Egyptian bondage. In Exodus, the Lord conspicuously calls the Captive out of the Tyrant's dungeon. But the Lord may also be regarded as calling the Tyrant out of the prison where he has held Israel captive. The Tyrant is Pharaoh. In Exodus, Pharaoh, greedy for Israel as his prey, is led on by God to drown himself in the Red Sea. In Mark, the Tyrant, in accordance with his own desire, is "permitted" to pass into swine, who hurry him and his hosts into the Sea of Galilee, where his legion, according to Mark and Luke, is "choked¹."

This "choking," or "suffocation," must not be passed over without notice. The LXX describes Saul as being "choked" by an evil spirit². And the word here used in the Syriac of Mark-Luke³ is connected with "legions" in a Targum on Esther, which uses the phrase "*the legions that choke you on your beds*⁴." It would be in accordance with the Jewish Law

¹ Mk v. 13 ἐπνίοντο, Lk. viii. 33 ἀπεπνίγη (but Mt. viii. 32 ἀπείθοντο).

² 1 S. xvi. 14 ἔπνιεν, Heb. "troubled."

³ See *Thes. Syr.* 1323—4 where it is also quoted from Ephrem as referring to the Egyptians.

⁴ *Levy Ch.* i. 270 b, *Esth.* ii. 1, 2. I am informed by my friend Mr E. N. Adler that it occurs in a letter (Targum Scheni, *Esth.* i. 3 (not i. 2)) supposed to be written to the queen of Sheba by Solomon who threatens her with his "kings, legions, and horsemen." The "kings" are "the beasts of the field." The "horsemen" are "the birds of the heavens." Then it is added "My hosts (חילי) are the legions that choke you on your beds."

Gen. r. on *Gen.* i. 7 explains why the Scripture, after describing God's work on the second day of the Creation—when He divided the waters above from the waters below—does not say, as on the other six days, "and God saw that it was good." The reason was,

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

of Retribution that *the evil spirits that "choke" men should be "choked" themselves*. Both the thought, therefore, and the word, point to a Jewish origin for this tradition.

Horae Hebraicae, commenting on the Marcan "legion," quotes the saying of Jesus in Matthew about "twelve *legions* of angels," and also one of Caesar's about the "ten *legions*" of Rome which could "pull down heaven itself¹." In the East as well as the West, "legion" was an expressive word. The demoniak's language sprang from a national dread of the Roman power symbolized by "legion." The "legion" is Rome in its darker aspect—not Rome exercising authority from above to judge justly, but Rome enforcing injustice. John regards the whole of "this world" as being possessed and dominated by a spirit of fear, which is the instrument employed by "the ruler of this world" to keep his slaves in subjection. This is symbolized by Rome or by Caesar². The rulers of the Jews are thus dominated when they say, as an excuse for murder, "*The Romans* [that is, *the legions*] will come and take away our place and our nation³." The Roman judge in Jerusalem is himself dominated by the servile spirit, though in a different way, when he allows himself to be forced into partnership with murderers by their cry, "If thou let this man go thou art not *Caesar's friend*⁴." The rulers of the Jews themselves confess their slavery to this Demon or Master of many legions when they exclaim "We have no king but *Caesar*⁵."

that the water was to be used as an instrument of wrath in the Deluge. God is compared to a King who has a "*cruel* (lit. *hard*) *legion*," and who says "Since this *legion* is so cruel, my name shall not be placed thereon."

¹ Mt. xxvi. 53, *Caes. Bell. Civ.* vi. 42.

² Epictetus says (i. 29. 60 foll.) that when Caesar comes thundering and lightening with threats of death or bribes of pleasure to which we yield, then we are mere slaves: "But take away these adjuncts and see how calm I shall be [in his presence]."

³ Jn xi. 48, see *Joh. Gr.* 2845.

⁴ Jn xix. 12.

⁵ Jn xix. 15. Comp. *Joh. Gr.* 2845 "the trees of the field chose the bramble to be their king."

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

§ 5. "Beseeching," "exhorting," or "comforting"

The verb here repeatedly rendered by R.V. "beseech" is *paracalein*, from which comes the noun *Paraclete*, i.e. "called-in-to-help"—commonly known as the "Advocate" or "Comforter¹." In literary Greek, the verb means "I call to my side [a friend to aid me]," and also "I exhort," "stimulate"; but in LXX it often means "I call aside [from trouble or sorrow]," that is "I console²." Some such meaning, in connection with good tidings, is frequent in Isaiah (LXX)³. Besides the variation in meaning, the verb also varies in construction according as it is found in different kinds of Greek. In LXX, outside Maccabees, it is not used in the sense of "exhorting" with a dependent clause ("exhorting some one to do something"); but in Maccabees a dependent clause about "doing" is sometimes added, mostly in the infinitive ("to do")—which is a frequent construction in literary Greek⁴.

¹ 1 Jn ii. 1 R.V. marg. "Or, Comforter, or, Helper." Παρακαλέω (*Joh. Voc.* 1674) occurs in the Gospels, Mk 9, Mt. 9, Lk. 7, Jn 9. In Mk v. 10—23 it occurs five times. Outside the Triple Tradition, it sometimes means "comfort," "exhort," e.g. in Mt. ii. 18, v. 4, Lk. iii. 18, xvi. 25.

² Steph. *Thes.*, after giving a column of other meanings, says, finally, "Consolor; unde παράκλησις, consolatio." And that is all. But it is frequent in LXX. In Is. xl. 1, li. 12, 18 (Sym.) and liv. 11 (Theod.) the LXX παρακαλέω is replaced by παρηγορέω, "I talk over," "soothe."

³ Is. xxxv. 4 "say to them that are of a fearful heart," LXX παρακαλέσατε, οἱ ὀλιγόψυχοι τῇ διανοίᾳ, where "comfort" (like our vernacular "cheer up") is perhaps intransitive. Clem. Rom. § 59 παρακάλεσον τοὺς ὀλιγόψυχους seems to allude to this passage; Barn. (apart from one instance in a quotation) uses παρακαλέω absolutely thus, (§ 19) πορευόμενος εἰς τὸ παρακαλεῖσθαι, i.e. "going [to people's homes] to give them the comfort of the gospel." In Is. xl. 2 "call to her" the context speaks of "comfort." In Is. xli. 27 παρακαλίσω represents "one-that-bringeth-good-tidings," usually translated εὐαγγελίζομαι.

⁴ See *Oxf. Conc.* quoting 2 Macc. ii. 3, iv. 34, vii. 5 etc. No instance of the use with ἵνα is given in *Oxf. Conc.* (but the context 78. (Mark v. 1—20)

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

In the Marcan narrative under consideration the construction is strangely varied. The verb is used twice with the conjunction "that¹," besides being used once with the infinitive², and once absolutely, with "saying³." There is a passage in Mark where the verb, with "that," introduces a petition to be allowed to do something—"They besought him *that* they might touch...."⁴ In this sentence if we substitute "he" for "they," we perceive there may be ambiguity. Greek makes no distinction between "*that he might*" and "*that he would*" in such a sentence as "He besought him *that he might* (or, *would*) touch." Go a step further, and substitute "go out" for "touch," and then who is to decide between the two meanings (1) "*that he, the beseecher, might be allowed to go out,*" and (2) "*that he, the person besought, would consent to go out*"?

Let us consider how these facts may bear on the interpretation of the following passage, which describes how "they,"

of 4 Macc. iv. 11, x. 1 has *ὅπως*). There is no instance with *ἵνα* in the Indices to Plato, Aristotle, Aristophanes, and Marcus Antoninus, and there are only two in Epictetus (who uses *παρακαλέω* fairly often with prepositions).

¹ Mk v. 10 *παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ*, *ιδ.* 18 *παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς ἵνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ᾖ* (where *ἵνα* does not introduce something to be *done*, but something to be *permitted*, as also in vi. 56). But Mk viii. 22 *παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἀφηγῆται* introduces something to be *done*.

² Mk v. 17 *παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν*.

³ Mk v. 12 *παρακάλεσαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Πέμψον ἡμᾶς...* (comp. Mt. viii. 31 *οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρακάλουν αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς...* Lk. viii. 32 *παρακάλεσαν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς...*). In Mk v. 12 several authorities insert "the devils" or "all the devils" before the pl. here in spite of the sing. in v. 10 *καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ*. R.V. expresses it correctly: "And *he* besought him much....And *they* (A.V. *all the devils*) besought him." Mark oscillates between the thought of the *one* demoniac, and the *many* demons in him.

There is a strange mixture in Mk v. 23 *παρακαλεῖ...λέγων ὅτι Τὸ θυγάτριόν μου...ἵνα...ἐπιθῇ* (comp. vii. 32 *παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιθῇ*).

⁴ Mk vi. 56, Mt. xiv. 36.

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

meaning everyone "in the city," as Matthew implies, or everyone "in the city and in the country" (as Mark and Luke imply)¹—practically rejected Jesus:—

Mk v. 17	Mt. viii. 34	Lk. viii. 37
And they began to beseech him to depart from their borders.	...And seeing him, they besought [him] that he would pass away (<i>lit.</i> change [his] place) ² from their borders.	And all the multitude of the country of the Gerasenes round about asked him to depart ³ from them.

It should be noted that the subject of the verb "besought" is variously and vaguely stated by Mark-Matthew, and that Luke amplifies and defines it. This was not unnecessary. For in Mark, if we supply the subject of the verb in the verse above quoted, from the verse preceding it ("they that saw it"), the meaning is "*The seeing [ones]*"—that is the eye-witnesses—"related to them [*i.e.* to the citizens] how it had befallen the demoniac...and [*they*] began to beseech him to depart." This might be taken to mean that "the seeing [ones]" besought. Matthew uses "*seeing*"—superfluously, it would seem, and out

¹ Mk v. 14 "in the city and the country, and they came..." sim. Lk. viii. 34. Mt. viii. 33—4 "into the city...all the city."

² "Change-his-place (*μεταβῆ*)."² It implies a complete change of place and does not occur in the Synoptists elsewhere except Mt. xi. 1, xii. 9, xv. 29 *μεταβάς ἐκεῖθεν* (of Jesus) and xvii. 20 (about the "removing" of a mountain) *μετάβα...καὶ μεταβήσεται*, and Lk. x. 7 *μὴ μεταβαίνειν ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν*. John represents Christ's brethren as saying to Him (vii. 3) *μετάβηθι ἐννεύθεν*, *i.e.* "go hence from the quiet of Galilee into the publicity of Jerusalem." Elsewhere in Jn (v. 24, xiii. 1, 1 Jn iii. 14) it means passing out of death into life or out of this world to the Father. Elsewhere in N.T. it occurs only once (Acts xviii. 7 "departed thence"), after Paul has said to the "blaspheming" Jews "Your blood be upon your own heads...from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles."

³ "Asked (*ἠρώτησεν*) him to depart (*ἀπελθεῖν*)."³ Luke retains the Marcan "depart," but not the Marcan "beseech." In Lk. viii. 37 "multitude" = *πληθος*, *i.e.* the population, not quite the same as *ὄχλος* in viii. 40.

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

of place ("seeing him [i.e. Jesus] they besought")—in such a way as to suggest that, in his Original, "seeing" may have meant "those seeing him [i.e. the man]," and that "the seers" were the beseechers. Luke sets this right by repeating "see" thrice:—"Having seen that which had come to pass the herdsmen fled and reported to the city... and [they, i.e. the citizens] came out to see that which had come to pass... and the seers reported to them... and the whole population of the surrounding country of the Gerasenes asked him to depart¹." This makes it quite clear, negatively, that "the beseechers," or (as Luke prefers to say) "the askers," were not "the seers," and, positively, that they were the whole of the Gerasenes.

From these bewildering obscurities, and from the freedom with which Luke attempts to make them clear, there emerge at least three conclusions:—The plural and the singular are liable to be interchanged in this narrative owing to the plurality of the spirits of the demoniac. The rejection of parts of the Marcan narrative by Matthew points to the conclusion that Matthew believed them to be "conflations," or repetitions, such as abound in Mark². Foremost among the words that appear to be suspiciously repeated is the word "beseech."

¹ In Lk. viii. 34 "they reported (ἀπήγγειλαν)" is parall. to Mk v. 14 (Mt. viii. 33) ἀπήγγειλαν. But in Lk. viii. 36 ἀπήγγειλαν is parall. to Mk v. 16 διηγήσαντο, "they related." Later on, Lk. viii. 39 "relate (διηγοῦ)" is parall. to Mk v. 19 "report (ἀπαγγέλλειν)." The Lucan repetitions, ἰδόντες... τὸ γεγονός, ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονός, and οἱ ἰδόντες are remarkable. Perhaps Luke means, in effect, "The traditions about οἱ ἰδόντες vary. We must distinguish the eye-witnesses, i.e. the herdsmen, from those who came out to see, i.e. the Gerasenes. Matthew, it is true, speaks of all the citizens as 'having seen him.' But Matthew means 'having seen Jesus.' The truth is, that, 'when they came to Jesus they found the demoniac clothed and in his right mind, sitting at the feet of Jesus....' This was really what they 'saw.'"

² On Marcan "conflations" generally, see *Clue passim*, and the Indices to Diatessarica ("conflations," "Mark"). In Mk v. 1—20, note, besides the repeated παρακαλέω, the repetition of μνημεῖα or μνήματα in *ib.* 2, 3, 5 whereas "tombs" occurs but once in the parallel Matthew-Luke.

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

Hence we have something more than mere conjecture, though a great deal less than demonstration, in the hypothesis that the above-quoted verse from Mark "began to beseech him to depart" was originally "began to *exhort* him to depart," and that it referred originally to a tradition about Jesus "*exhorting*" those oppressed by the devil to pass out of the devil's prison into the freedom of God; somewhat as Peter "*exhorted* them [*i.e.* the Jews] saying, Save yourselves from this crooked generation¹."

In that case, the call would be somewhat similar to the summons in a saying of Jesus which Matthew places a little before this narrative, "Follow me, and leave the dead to bury their own dead²." Those words seem to imply that the man addressed was living in some "city of the dead." Using another metaphor, we might say that he was one of the "*fellow-citizens of the swine*"—as Origen characteristically calls the Gergesenes³.

§ 6. *Versions of the narrative in an Apocryphal Gospel*⁴

The Arabic Gospel of the Infancy, whatever may be its date, illustrates the distinction, drawn above, between (1) the story of the Demoniacs or Devils that barred the way or attacked those who came by the way, and (2) the story of the

¹ Acts ii. 40.

² Mt. viii. 22. To this is added in the parall. Lk. ix. 60 "do thou go and carry-tidings of (διεγγελλε) the kingdom of God."

³ See Origen *Comm. Joann.* vi. 24 (Lomm. i. 239) where *οι των χοίρων πολῖται* is admitted to be in the text, as also in *ib.* x. 10 (Lomm. i. 295) (though some editors have ventured to substitute *χαρίων*).

It should be added that, in addition to the possible confusion of thought, above mentioned, between the singular and plural, the plural of "*began* [*to exhort, or beseech*]," ΗΡΞΑΤΟ, might easily be confused by scribes with the singular ΗΡΞΑΤΟ, in the written text of Mk v. 17.

⁴ See *Evangelia Apocrypha*, 1853, Tischendorf p. 175 foll.

THE DEMONIAC AND THE SWINE

Demoniac that had been bound with chains, who cut himself with stones.

The first of the apocryphal stories refers to a young man, the son of a priest of an idol-temple in Egypt. The youth had been "three years¹ beset by several demons...and when the demons seized him, he rent his garments and remained naked², and attacked men with stones³." On the arrival of the babe Jesus, the idol collapsed and "all—[both the] inhabitants of Egypt and others—rushed together at the fall thereof." The demoniac enters the place where the babe's swaddling bands were lying and places one of them on his head. The demons flee forth from his mouth in the form of crows and serpents. There is no mention of swine.

The second story describes the departure of Joseph and Mary from Egypt: "Departing hence they came to a place where there were robbers, who had despoiled many [travellers] of their baggage and garments and had bound them. Then the robbers heard a mighty sound, like the sound of a great king with army and horsemen and drums coming forth from his city⁴."

¹ *Evang. Infant. Arab.* § 10 "Erat huic sacerdoti filius triennis ab aliquot daemonibus obsessus." The context shews that "*triennis*" must here indicate the duration of the possession. The writer adds "*multa loquebatur et proferebat*," perhaps an attempt to render Mk v. 10 *παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλά*.

² Lk. viii. 27 "he would not put on a cloak (*ἱμάτιον*)" is the only Synoptic phrase that suggests nakedness, or tearing off one's garments, at this point; but, later on, Mk v. 15 "cloaked (*ἱματισμένος*)" indicates that nakedness should have been mentioned by Mark here. Perhaps Mk v. 3—4 (mentioning "chains") originally meant that the demoniac would not bind even a girdle round him. Later on, the writer says, of a woman, § 14 "*neque vestimenta pati...poterat*."

³ "*Homines lapidibus petebat*" is probably a form of Mk v. 5 *κατακρίτων ἱαντὸν λίθοις*, see below, pp. 85—6.

⁴ "*Tum latrones...regis...ex urbe sua egressi*" would suit the story of the *Descensus* better if we could connect "*egressi*" with "*latrones*" instead of "*regis*" ("the robbers came forth from their city"). But the "*latrones*" have only a "*locus*," not an "*urbs*."

THE DEMONIAC AND THE SWINE

Thereat, in terror, the robbers left all their spoil. But the captives arose, loosing one another's bonds, and they took back their baggage and departed. There, seeing Joseph and Mary approaching, they said to them, 'Where is that king the mighty sound of whose approach the robbers heard, and departed, leaving us safe?' Joseph replied, 'He will come behind us¹.'

This has features resembling those of the *Descensus ad Inferos*. The writer roughly follows Matthew. He borrows nothing but the "binding" from Mark. And to that he gives a different application. It was the "robbers," he says, who "bound" the captives (not keepers of a madman, who bound the madman for his good). Also the chains were not broken beforehand (as in Mark). They were not broken till the sound of the King's arrival reached the robbers and their prisoners².

Next comes a narrative blending Mark and Luke, but with Luke predominant. The sufferer is a woman: "Thereafter they came into another city where there was a demoniac woman, whom Satan—accursed and rebellious—had beset³ when once she had gone out to fetch water at night. She could neither bear clothes⁴ nor live in a house; and as often as they tied her up with chains and thongs⁵, she broke them and fled naked into waste places⁶; and, standing in cross-roads⁷ and cemeteries, she kept pelting people with stones; but for

¹ *Evang. Infant. Arab.* § 13.

² Comp. *Descens. ad Inf.* § 5 (21) (Tisch. pp. 306—7) "The angels of the Lord say: The Lord strong and mighty....And straightway... the brazen gates were shattered, and the iron bars broken, and all the dead that had been bound were loosed from their bonds, and we with them."

³ Comp. Lk. xiii. 16 "a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, [these] eighteen years."

⁴ Comp. Lk. viii. 27 οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο ἱμάτιον.

⁵ Comp. Mk v. 4 πέδαις καὶ ἀλύσεσι.

⁶ Comp. Lk. viii. 29 τὰς ἐρήμους.

⁷ No Synoptic narrative mentions "cross-roads (compita)." Mk v. 5 has ὄρεσιν.

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

her own [*family*] (*suus*) she was preparing very heavy evils¹. And when the Lady Mary saw her she pitied her; and upon this, Satan straightway left her, and, fleeing in the form of a young man, departed, saying, Woe is me because of thee, Mary, and because of thy son. So that woman was cured of her torment, and, being restored to her senses, she blushed on account of her nakedness; and, shunning people's sight, she departed to *her own* [*family*] (*suos*). After she had put on her garments, she related the matter to [her] father and *her own* [*family*] (*suisque*)²; and they, since they were the chief people of the country, received the Lady Mary and Joseph with the greatest honour and hospitality."

Why do these narratives all omit the "swine"? The first of the three stories mentions evil spirits in the form of "crows and serpents," but not in that of swine. Perhaps those who framed the stories found that "swine" did not accord with their framework. But more causes than one might explain the exclusion of this detail. The New Hebrew and Aramaic words for "going round," "circle" or "neighbourhood," and for "swine," are very similar³. Also, in two passages of Ben Sira the Syriac Version substitutes "swine" for a form of this word meaning "go round"⁴.

The phrases "pelting people with stones" and also "preparing evils for her own family," may be explained from Mark's

¹ *Evang. Infant. Arab.* § 14. "Et in compitis sepulcretisque stans homines lapidibus impetebat, suis vero gravissima mala parabat." See below, p. 86.

² Comp. Mk v. 19 "Go to thy house unto (*πρὸς*) thine own family (*τοὺς σούς*)," Lk. viii. 39 "Go back to thy house."

³ Levy ii. 33—4 חוּרָה may mean (1) "going round" or "returning," (2) "a sow," and see Levy *Ch.* i. 248 on the meaning "round and round." It occurs in the Targ. of Ps. lix. 6 "make a noise like a dog and go round about the city."

⁴ See *Thes. Syr.* 1239 quoting Sir. xxii. 13 and xxxiii (Gr. xxxvi) 5 and suggesting that the Syr. was from a Heb. or Chald. version. In xxxiii. 5 "a rolling axle-tree" (i.e. "that which goes round") corresponds to Syr. and Arab. "hog."

THE DEMONiac AND THE SWINE

"cutting himself with stones." For the same Hebrew verb that may mean "cut" may also mean "prepare evil¹." And "himself," when expressed by the Hebrew phrase "his own flesh," may be taken as "his family (*or*, relations)²."

It is interesting to note that these apocryphal narratives omit all mention of the place to which the unclean spirits were driven. Even that one of them which describes the spirits as going forth in the forms of crows and serpents does not say whither they vanished. One reason for not saying anything may be that the writer did not know what to say. The early opponent of Christianity against whom Macarius wrote lays great emphasis on the peculiar Marcan tradition that the devils besought Jesus "not to cast them out outside *the country*, or *place*, or *province*." Reiterating the word, he scoffs at the Saviour, who saved one man to ruin others, permitting these devastating devils to carry their devastations from "*country*" to "*country*," into many "*countries*," instead of suppressing them altogether³.

§ 7. "*Outside the country*" in Mark, and "*into the abyss*" in Luke⁴

Luke apparently interprets Mark as meaning "outside the earth," *i.e.* outside the region of human life and inside the region of disembodied spirits, that is, "the abyss." But if

¹ Heb. נקט = κακοποιέω (14). The same letters frequently (Gesen. 949 b) mean "break in pieces."

² Prov. xi. 17 "troubleth *his own flesh* (LXX σῶμα αὐτοῦ)" is taken by Gesenius (985) as "troubleth *himself*," but Rashi says "*his relations* (*propinquos suos*)," and that is the usual meaning, as in Levit. xviii. 6, 12, 13 etc. LXX οἰκείος.

³ Macar. iii. 4 (pp. 55—7). After quoting Mark's χώρα, and saying that the devils ought to have been sent into the χαρίον, *i.e.* "the strong place, or prison," of "the abyss" (Lk. viii. 31) which they deprecated, he mentions χώρα, sing. and pl., four times in bitter reiterations.

⁴ Mk v. 10 ἔξω τῆς χώρας, Lk. viii. 31 εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον.

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

Mark had meant "earth," he could have written it. The fact that he wrote "country" instead indicates that he meant "country." Matthew might well omit it, for it is extremely obscure.

Mark's word, *chōra*, for "country (sing.*)" occurs in LXX for the first time in three consecutive passages of Genesis describing how Haran, the brother of Abraham, died "in the country of the Chaldaeans," and how God led Abraham out of that "country¹." Philo and Origen agree that this "country" means hallucination, or false worship². The Hebrew has "Ur³ of the Chaldaeans." The LXX, in its rendering, perhaps desired to give a suggestion of inferiority. It was not a "land"—like the "land" of milk and honey—but rather a "province" or "separate region" with an implied notion of subordinate jurisdiction, and sometimes of tribute⁴.

According to this view, when Luke represents Satan as shewing to Jesus "all the kingdoms of the inhabited [earth]," and as saying "To thee will I give *all this authority*...for it is given over to me⁵," this in fact describes "the ruler of this

¹ Gen. xi. 28, 31, xv. 7 *χώρα* in each case (but pl. *χώραι* in Gen. x. 20, 31 = pl. of *χωρά*). Note that *אור* ("Ur") might be transliterated as *χωρ* according to the precedents of *Χαάξ* 1 Chr. viii. 35, 36, ix. 42 (A), *Χαυδάμ* Jerem. l. 44 (A?), *Χεμήρ* Nehem. vii. 40 (see *Oxf. Conc.*).

² Philo i. 486 and *Quaest. Gen.* ad loc. (P.A. 167), Origen *Hom. Jerem.* xx. 4 (Lomm. xv. 401) "Potens est Deus qui et nobis tribuat de terra Chaldaeorum exire."

³ "Ur," see *Son* 3369 b, 3501 f foll.

⁴ Comp. Lam. i. 1 "How doth the city sit solitary...princess among the provinces, she is become tributary." That is, as the Targum says, The provinces once paid tribute to Jerusalem, but now Jerusalem pays tribute. Hence she might be called, in some sense, a *medinah* or "province." But Jews would distinguish (Nehem. i. 3) between "Jerusalem" and the "province" of Judaea (see Levy iii. 30 a). *Χώρα* = *medinah*, "province" freq. in Ezra, Nehem., Esth. and Dan. In Syriac (*Thes. Syr.* 844) *medinah* sometimes means "city."

⁵ Lk. iv. 5—6.

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

world" as saying "All this is my *medinah*, my *province*, *place*, or *jurisdiction*." Hermas, who often helps us to understand Mark, uses the word *chōra* in only one passage; and there it is put into the mouth of the lord of the visible city of this present world as opposed to the Lord of the invisible City: "The lord of this *country* justly says to thee, Either obey my laws or give place [and depart] from my *country*¹." Somewhat similarly in Mark we may suppose that the Master of the Legion, who holds rule in the "place" or "city" of Mansoul, may claim it as a right that he should not be compelled to give up his jurisdiction: "It is given over to me. It is *my province*. I ought not to be driven out of it."

There remains the difficulty of believing that Jesus could have been supposed by any Evangelist to have driven out evil spirits (by act or by permission) into unoffending beasts. At this point there comes to our aid the hypothesis of verbal misunderstanding. The demoniac may have felt a horror lest he and his legion should be hurled to the bottomless abyss (mentioned by Luke) and may have prayed that at all events this might not be his fate: "If it must be, permit us to go to *some place round about*." There is comparatively little difficulty in believing that Jesus permitted that. "*Round about*," as has been shewn above, may have been erroneously taken to mean "*the swine*²." Such an error would be all the more natural if the fact was that the madman actually saw the forms, not of

¹ Hermas *Sim.* i. 4 *ἐκχώρει ἐκ τῆς χώρας μου*. *Ἐκχώρει* "give place [and depart]" constitutes a sort of third mention of *χώρα*. The explanation of *χώρα* given in *Clue 160* is based on an insufficient collection of facts.

² See above, p. 85. It should be added that the names "Gerasa," "Gadara," and "Gergesha (clods, mud, or mire)" suggest notions of herds, and the driving of herds, and the mud in which herds of swine wallow, and are all adapted to favour the view that the inhabitants of these places were themselves of a swinish nature.

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

crows or serpents¹, but of swine, the hateful swine of Rome, driven forth from himself to perish in the Lake².

§ 8. "*Outside*," applied to the "casting out" of "*the ruler of this world*," in John

Although John never mentions Christ's visible acts of exorcism, he represents Jesus Himself as saying "Now is the judgment of this world, now *shall the prince of this world be cast out*. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all [men] to myself. But this he spake signifying by what manner of death he was about to die³." This is the first of three passages where the Fourth Gospel mentions "*the prince of this (or, the) world*," always in utterances of Jesus⁴. The term was frequently used by the Jews to mean "the angel of death," or "the angel of the nations as distinct from Israel." It does not always imply what we should imply by Satanic hostility to man⁵. John appears to use it in the sense of Satan, or Enemy, but in such a way as to imply that the enmity is exercised through this present and visible world, which often overshadows, in the mind of man, the invisible and spiritual world. Thus "the world" is, in effect, the "city," "province,"

¹ See above, pp. 83, 85.

² Comp. *Mids. N. Dream* v. 1. 9:

"One sees more devils than vast hell can hold,
That is the madman."

³ Jn xii. 31—3. See *Son* 3391—407, 3449—51, on the "lifting up" of the Son of Man, alluding to the Crucifixion. It may of course allude also at the same time to the Ascension.

⁴ The two others are (xiv. 30) "There cometh *the prince of the world*, and he hath nothing in me" (i.e. no sin in me, nothing that falls under his dominion), (xvi. 11) "Because *the prince of this world* hath been judged." *Ἀρχὴν* is rendered by R.V. "prince" in this phrase, and not "ruler." The rendering has the advantage of distinguishing the title from the Supreme Ruler.

⁵ See *Hov. Heb.* (on Jn xii. 31) quoting Sanhedr. 94 a "When God was about to make Hezekiah the Messiah, saith *the prince of the world* to him, 'O eternal Lord, perform the desire of this just one.'"

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

or "place," mentioned in Hermas as above quoted, the prince of which says to us on earth "Obey me, or else go out of my city."

About the Johannine word "outside," if we ask "Outside of what?" we are left in doubt as to the answer. The meaning may be "Outside the *cosmos*, or *beautiful and orderly world*, where the prince has wrongfully enthroned himself." But on the other hand *cosmos* may mean the world in a bad sense, the "world" that "passeth away¹." We may be intended to see the Prince of the *cosmos*, the *defiled and corrupted world*, descending, *cosmos* and all, into an abyss of darkness. And the context still further unsettles any definite local notions we may have formed about "outside" by representing the Messiah Himself as being removed "from the earth." The removal, it is true, is one of exaltation. But it is the exaltation of crucifixion. It means "If I be lifted up on the cross." This—like most of Christ's deepest teaching in the Fourth Gospel—is a paradox². And then the following words "I will draw all men unto myself" contain a further paradox, suggesting the question "Whither? Are all men to be drawn up to the Cross and to stay there?" Doubtless the meaning is, that we are to be drawn first up to the Cross, and then along with the ascending Cross, up to the right hand of God³; but it is all very mysterious and, as it were, dislocating.

Perhaps it is, in some sense, deliberately dislocating, or at all events unsettling. The Evangelist, though not directly, is indirectly polemical. He appears to be attempting, and successfully attempting, to unsettle and detach his readers from their fixed and hardened notions about local exorcism.

¹ 1 Jn ii. 17, comp. 1 Cor. vii. 31.

² Concerning the Hebrew and Greek play on the double meaning of "lift up"—(1) crucify, (2) exalt—see *Joh. Gr.* 2211 c, 2642 b, and add *Numb.* 1. (on *Numb.* i. 47 Wü. p. 9) commenting on the twofold "lifting up the head" in *Gen.* xl. 13, 19, 20.

³ See *Evang. Petr.* § 10 for the description of the ascending Cross.

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

They are not to think of evil spirits driven out of a local human body into a local prison-house of demons. Christians are to turn their minds to the thought of Christ's good Spirit breathed into their soul or inmost being so as to make their union with Him independent of place. We are not even to prize our own "soul," as long as it is "in this world." If we serve Christ we shall be where He is: "He that loveth his soul destroyeth it, and he that hateth his soul in this world shall keep it to eternal life. If any one be ministering to me let him follow me, and where I am there shall also be the minister that is truly mine¹."

No mention has been made above of the textual variations in the Johannine saying "The prince of this world shall be cast out *outside*" which have induced Blass to print it "The prince of this world shall be cast *down*²." Several authorities substitute "*down*" for "*outside*³." But Epiphanius, who is one of these, indicates a motive that may have induced scribes (wrongly) to substitute "*down*," when he quotes at the same time the Lucan saying "fallen from heaven." "*Down*" may have seemed to express, better and more definitely than "*outside*," the defeat and fall of Satan⁴.

Macarius has some important remarks on the meaning and variations of the text and (incidentally) on the *chōra*, or "province," placed under "the ruler of this world." After saying "Some copies have '*cast down*'," he adds "The name '*world*'

¹ Jn xii. 25—6.

² On Jn xii. 31, W.H. and R.V. give no marginal alternative, and Westcott ("*cast out...from the region of his present sway*") assumes the reading "*outside*."

³ SS "is thrown *down*," *b, e, Corb. mittetur deorsum*, Epiphan. *Adv. Haer.* ii. 2. 66, 680 D, 681 C βληθήσεται κάτω (quoted along with Lk. x. 18 "fallen from heaven") and sim. Chrys. *ad loc.* Comp. Rev. xii. 9.

⁴ The same motive might induce Luke, instead of the Marcan "*outside*," to substitute "*into the abyss*."

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

(*cosmos*) is here tropically given to human-nature..." Then he says that, whereas the so-called ruler could not rule over non-human nature, since that is under absolute control, "he did obtain control over human nature, since that is under its own control¹." This "ruler" is "not the Demiurgus or Lawgiver [of the universe]" but "a kind of archdemon" who "has come to rule over the licentious because of their licentiousness and has artfully enslaved those who are under their own control": and he did not attain sovereignty through violence or mere force, "but by taking counsel as it were with [men], and by versatile devices, he brought under his control the herd [that is called] rational, which herd is here called metaphorically *cosmos* (i.e. world). For man is appropriately called *cosmos* (i.e. order and beauty) since he is the *cosmos* of the *cosmos* and [of] an admirable frame, a creation honourable and made for honour."

In what follows, the writer speaks of the Cosmos as he might speak of the demoniak freed from the Legion, and at the close he says: "To be cast down, then, in the case of the ruler of the world, is nothing but to be hurled from his authority as ruler. The fall thus darkly suggested here is not from a literal place². It consists in his being stripped of the honourable estimation that he possessed when he was actively worshipped by men in their vileness." Similarly, "to-day a king may *cast down* a ruler of a *chōra*, province, . . . and everyone will say that he is '*cast down*' . . . even though he goes on living in the same house in the *chōra*³." So it is, says Macarius, with "the ruler of the world."

¹ Macar. ii. 20 (p. 37) τῶν ἀνθρώπων (ἤρξε) διὰ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον, τῶν δ' ἀψύχων ἀμήχανον διὰ τὸ ὑπεξούσιον.

² Macar. ii. 20 (p. 41) Οὐ τοπικὴν ᾤδε τὴν πᾶσιω αἰνιττόμενος.

³ This sentence, combined with the above-quoted use of *chōra* in Hermas, confirms the view taken above that the original of *chōra* meant "*province*," in Mark, and that Macarius is alluding to that meaning. Perhaps, too, there is an allusion to the "*herd*" of swine in the sarcastic phrase τῆς λογικῆς ἀγέλης, "the rational *herd*," applied to humanity enslaved by the δρχων τοῦ κόσμου.

THE DEMONIAK AND THE SWINE

The remarks of Macarius help us to realise the importance that would be attached by a writer like the Fourth Evangelist to the removal of the obstacle to belief presented to educated Greeks by Synoptic accounts of exorcism. In this particular story, the going forth of "swine" into the "abyss" is probably no invention of a Christian evangelist or poet, but based on some sayings uttered by a demoniac in all good faith about what he had himself seen and himself experienced. Yet, as related by the Synoptists, the story is liable to encourage many honest and pious readers to believe that Jesus did what, in an ordinary prophet, they would have blamed as being unjustifiable. It did not lie within the province of the Fourth Gospel to correct their possible misunderstanding. Perhaps indeed John himself accepted the narrative as mainly, if not entirely, true. But putting all exorcistic narrative aside, John has devoted himself to the object of inspiring his readers with a spiritual faith that should override difficulties arising from historical details of doubtful authenticity. He has also indicated to us that the rulers of the Jews in Jerusalem were themselves, in effect, possessed by the unclean spirit of the Roman Legion with a possession far more deadly than that of the demoniac by the Sea of Galilee.

CHAPTER IV

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

[Mark v. 21—43]

§ I. *Differences in the Synoptic narratives*¹

IN the three Synoptic narratives printed below, Matthew omits many of Mark's details. But Luke does not omit them.

¹ Mk v. 21—43
(R.V.)

(21) And when Jesus had crossed over again in the boat unto the other side, a great multitude was gathered unto him: and he was by the sea.

(22) And there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name; and seeing him, he falleth at his feet,

(23) And beseecheth him much, saying, My little daughter is at the point of death: [I pray thee], that thou come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be made whole (*or*, saved) and live.

(24) And he went with him; and a great multitude followed him, and they thronged him.

Mt. ix. 18—26
(R.V.)

(18) While he spake these things unto them, behold, there came a ruler (W.H. *ἀρχων* '[εἰς] προσελθὼν', marg. *ἀρχων εἰσελθὼν*), and worshipped him, saying, My daughter is even now dead: but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live.

(19) And Jesus arose, and followed him, and [so did] his disciples.

Lk. viii. 40—56
(R.V.)

(40) And as Jesus returned, the multitude welcomed him; for they were all waiting for him.

(41) And behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue: and he fell down at Jesus' feet, and besought him to come into his house;

(42) For he had an only daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a-dying. But as he went the multitudes thronged him.

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

Consequently no discussion of them is necessitated by considerations of the rule of Johannine Intervention. A few however

Mk v. 21—43
(R.V.) *contd.*

(25) And a woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years,

(26) And had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse,

(27) Having heard the things concerning Jesus, came in the crowd behind, and touched his garment.

(28) For she said, If I touch but his garments, I shall be made whole (*or, saved*).

(29) And straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up; and she felt in her body that she was healed of her plague (*lit. scourge*).

(30) And straightway Jesus, perceiving in himself that the power [proceeding] from him had gone forth, turned him about in the crowd, and said, Who touched my garments?

(31) And his disciples said unto him, Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me?

(32) And he looked round about

Mt. ix. 18—26
(R.V.) *contd.*

(20) And behold, a woman, who had an issue of blood twelve years,

came behind him, and touched the border of his garment:

(21) For she said within herself, If I do but touch his garment, I shall be made whole (*or, saved*).

Lk. viii. 40—56
(R.V.) *contd.*

(43) And a woman having an issue of blood twelve years, which had spent all her living upon physicians, and could not be healed of any, (*some anc. auth., followed by W.H., omit had spent ...and*)

(44) Came behind him, and touched the border of his garment:

and immediately the issue of her blood stanch'd.

(45) And Jesus said, Who is it that touched me? And when all denied, Peter said, and they that were with him (*some anc. auth. omit and they that were with him*), Master (*ἐπιστάτα*), the multitudes press thee and crush [thee].

(46) But Jesus said, Some one did touch me: for I perceived that power had gone forth from me.

(47) And when the

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

may be profitably noticed as illustrating the nature of the difficulties placed in the way of the Fourth Evangelist by the differences of the Three.

Mk v. 21—43
(R.V.) *contd.*

to see her that had done this thing.

(33) But the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what had been done to her, came and fell down before him, and told him all the truth.

(34) And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole (*or*, saved thee); go in peace, and be whole of thy plague (*lit.* scourge).

(35) While he yet spake, they come from the ruler of the synagogue's [house], saying, Thy daughter is dead: why troublest thou the Master (*or*, Teacher) (*διδάσκαλον*) any further?

(36) But Jesus, not heeding (*or*, over-hearing) the word spoken, saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, Fear not, only believe.

(37) And he suffered no man to follow with him, save Peter, and James, and John the brother of James.

(38) And they come to the house of the ruler of the synagogue; and he beholdeth a tumult, and [many] weeping and wailing greatly.

(39) And when

Mt. ix. 18—26
(R.V.) *contd.*

(22) But Jesus turning and seeing her said, Daughter, be of good cheer; thy faith hath made thee whole (*or*, saved thee). And the woman was made whole (*or*, saved) from that hour.

(23) And when Jesus came into the ruler's house, and saw the flute-players, and the crowd making a tumult,

(24) He said, Give place:

Lk. viii. 40—56
(R.V.) *contd.*

woman saw that she was not hid, she came trembling, and falling down before him declared in the presence of all the people for what cause she touched him, and how she was healed immediately.

(48) And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole (*or*, saved thee); go in peace.

(49) While he yet spake, there cometh one from the ruler of the synagogue's [house], saying, Thy daughter is dead; trouble not the Master (*or*, Teacher) (*διδάσκαλον*).

(50) But Jesus hearing it, answered him, Fear not: only believe, and she shall be made whole (*or*, saved).

(51) And when he came to the house, he suffered not any man to enter in with him, save Peter, and John, and James, and the father of the maiden and her mother.

(52) And all were weeping, and bewailing her: but he said,

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

Mark and Luke give the name of Jairus to a chief or ruler of the synagogue. Matthew omits the name, and possibly he is justified¹. Matthew also omits the statement that Jairus'

Mk v. 21—43
(R.V.) *contd.*

he was entered in, he saith unto them, Why make ye a tumult, and weep? the child is not dead, but sleepeth.

(40) And they laughed him to scorn. But he, having put them all forth, taketh the father of the child and her mother and them that were with him, and goeth in where the child was.

(41) And taking the child by the hand, he saith unto her, Talitha cumi: which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, Arise.

(42) And straightway the damsel rose up and walked; for she was twelve years old. And they were amazed straightway with a great amazement.

(43) And he charged them much that no man should know this: and he commanded that [something] should be given her to eat.

Mt. ix. 18—26
(R.V.) *contd.*

for the damsel is not dead, but sleepeth.

And they laughed him to scorn.

(25) But when the crowd was put forth, he entered in,

and took her by the hand; and the damsel arose.

(26) And the fame hereof went forth into all that land.

Lk. viii. 40—56
(R.V.) *contd.*

Weep not; for she is not dead, but sleepeth.

(53) And they laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead.

(54) But he, taking her by the hand, called, saying, Maiden, arise.

(55) And her spirit returned, and she rose up immediately: and he commanded that [something] be given her to eat.

(56) And her parents were amazed: but he charged them to tell no man what had been done.

¹ Mk v. 22 SS gives Jairus as "Ioarash" ~~עֲרֹאשׁ~~. Delitzsch gives Mk's contextual words as "one of the heads of (~~עֲרֹאשׁ~~) the synagogue." This similarity between "Jairus" and "head" (or "ruler") indicates possibilities of confusion. In Gen. xlv. 21, ~~עֲרֹאשׁ~~, *Rōsh*, is a name of one of the sons of Benjamin. It is retained by Jer. Targ. with the addition that he was "a chief in his father's house," and Gen. i. *ad loc.* explains why he was called "chief." In Ezek. xxxviii. 2,

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

daughter was twelve years old. But this may be because it was an isolated tradition, placed by Mark almost at the end, but by Luke at the beginning of his narrative¹. Matthew may have regarded it as referring to the duration (mentioned in the context) of the disease of the woman with the issue². Quite at the end of Mark's narrative come words that may be literally rendered "said [for something] to be given to her to eat³." This might be taken to mean that the girl (thereby proving that she was restored to life) asked for something to eat⁴. Similarly a son of R. Gamaliel, at the exact moment when he was cured of fever by the prayers of R. Chanina, "asked for something to eat⁵." Matthew, omitting this request (after omitting the words *Talitha cumi*), has, in its place, "And there went forth this report into the whole of that land⁶." It is by no means improbable that this, too, is based on some Hebrew or Aramaic corruption⁷.

3, xxxix. 1 "*Rosh*" is regarded by Gesenius (912 b) as a name, but rendered by the Targ. as "*head*."

¹ Mk v. 42, Lk. viii. 42.

² Mk v. 25, Mt. ix. 20, Lk. viii. 43. In Lk., the two mentions of "twelve years" come in consecutive verses.

³ Mk v. 43 εἶπεν δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν, Lk. viii. 55 διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν.

⁴ For Heb. "say," meaning "command," see Gesen. 56 b. This is unambiguously expressed by Lk. διέταξεν, but not quite by Mk εἶπεν.

⁵ So Schlatter (on Jn iv. 53) quoting *J. Berach.* 9 d. A similar story in *B. Berach.* 34 b has "asked them for something to drink."

⁶ In Mk v. 41 Ταλιθαῖ, *e* has *tabea acultha*, and Dr Chase suggests (*Syro-Latin Text* p. 110) that this is a relic of the word סאכולתא "food." If so, it may have some connection with the Mk-Lk. tradition about "giving food." The word עָבַד in Schlatter's quotation from *J. Berach.* "*demand*ed food," might be rendered by *tabea*.

⁷ The above-mentioned word *acultha*, if the initial *a* were dropped after the final *a* in *tabea*, would become *cultha*, and confusable with words meaning (*Thes. Syr.* 1737) "*universim*" etc., so as to give rise to Matthew's view that "the fame went out [*everywhere*, or] *into all that land*."

Another explanation, however, of Matthew's words is that they

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

The Synoptists also differ as to the interval between the girl's death and restoration to life. In Mark and Luke, her father describes her to Jesus as "breathing her last" or "in the act of dying"; but in Matthew he says "She has just died¹." This needs little comment since "she is dying"—in Greek, "she *dies*"—when rendered into reported speech, might easily be taken to refer to an accomplished fact: "he said *that she [had] died*."

As for Marcan peculiarities omitted by Luke, the principal one refers to the fact that physicians, attempting to cure the woman with the issue, caused her the loss of her fortune and made her worse rather than better². This may possibly be explained from a Hebrew original differently translated by Mark and Luke³. In any case, it can hardly be regarded as a failure of the rule of Johannine Intervention.

are a paraphrase of Mk v. 42 "they were amazed with a great amazement." Lk. viii. 56 restricts the amazement to "the parents," Diatess. to "her father." Matthew extends it to "all that land." "Hearing" and "amazement" (שָׁמַע and שָׁחַח) are confusable in Heb. (see *Indices to Diatessarica*, p. 33).

¹ Mk v. 23 ἰσχύτως ἔχει, Mt. ix. 18 ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν, Lk. viii. 42 ἀπέθνησκεν.

² Mk v. 26, parall. to Lk. viii. 43 οὐκ ἴσχυον ἀπ' οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι. In Lev. v. 7, xxvii. 8 οὐκ ἰσχύει with χεῖρ means "cannot afford," "is not rich enough," so that Luke's original may have meant "Was not rich enough to [pay physicians so as to] be healed by anyone."

³ Lk. viii. 43 ἀπ' οὐδενὸς (not ὑπ' οὐδενὸς) is given by W.H. without alternative. But θεραπεύω ἀπὸ in Luke elsewhere (3 or 4 times, not in Bible elsewhere, except 2 K. ix. 16 (LXX), nor in Steph. Thes.) means "heal of" some disease. Ἀπὸ, if correct, suggests that the original meant "healed from any part of her disease," and that it corresponds to Mk v. 26 "not benefited, but rather made worse."

There is no space to deal with other Marcan details. But see *Clue 84* foll. and *241* foll. for proof that Heb. "And be thou made whole" might be confused with "And she was made whole." In Mk v. 34 (*Joh. Voc.* 1728 e) "(1) go back (ὑπάγε) in peace and (2) be whole (or, sound) (ὑγιής) from thy plague (μάστιγος)," there seems

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

There is, however, one important point as to which John does appear to intervene in order to shew the reality of Christ's power of revivification. But the intervention, if there is one, is not for Mark against Luke. Some might say it was for Luke against Mark and Matthew. More exactly, it might be described as an intervention against an unspiritual interpretation of words assigned to Jesus by all the Synoptists "she is not dead but sleepeth." Luke attempts to meet such a misinterpretation. But John meets it in a different way, as will be seen in the next section.

§ 2. "Knowing that she was dead" in Luke, "Lazarus is dead" in John¹

Luke has two ways of meeting the objection that, if the girl was, as Jesus declared, "*not*" really "*dead*," then no miracle followed. First, he puts into the mouths of the crowd in the ruler's house an implied statement—which he does not make in his own person—that she "*was*" really "*dead*." Then he adds, in his own person, after Jesus has pronounced the command to "*arise*," that "*her spirit returned*²." This, he might suppose, would lead his readers to conclude that it had previously passed out of her, and consequently that she *had really been* "*dead*." But the usage of Scripture would not justify the conclusion³. Hence, this is not quite satisfactory. Nor do

to be a conflation. The parall. Lk. viii. 48 has simply "go (πορεύου) in peace." Mt. ix. 22 has "and the woman was made sound (ἰσώθη) from that [very] hour," i.e. at once. Heb. ענן "*moment*" might be confused with נגף "*plague*" or "*stroke*" (מִדֹּסִיף (3), פִּלְגָּה (2)) so that "from the *plague*" might be confused with "in that same *moment*." See Exod. xxxiii. 5 "*moment* (ענן)," LXX πλῆγην (Tromm. leg. נגפ).

¹ Lk. viii. 53 εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν, Jn xi. 14 Λάζαρος ἀπέθανεν.

² Lk. viii. 55 καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς.

³ See Judg. xv. 19 "And his [Samson's] *spirit returned*, and he lived," καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔζησεν, and comp. 1 S. xxx. 12 (Heb.). Neither of these cases implies anything more than recovery of strength after extreme faintness.

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

we get much help from Jerome (who explains Matthew's "*not dead*" by saying "because all things live to God") or from other early comments¹. Perhaps the most satisfactory explanation is the one given by Pseudo-Jerome on Mark, that Jesus meant "She is dead to you [the crowd]; she sleeps to me."

John represents Jesus (in the Raising of Lazarus) as Himself using the terms "*sleeping*" and "*dead*" in such a way as to give the disciples at first a false impression which He Himself subsequently removes². Thus John meets the objection that what Christ called a mere "sleep," and "not death," Christ's disciples called "death" in order to magnify their Master's fame. He answers, in effect, "It was the custom of Jesus to describe 'death' as 'sleep.' I can give you an instance where He did thus. But on the same occasion He not only described it as 'death' but brought the dead man out of his tomb, after he had been four days dead. No one can doubt that this was real 'death.' It is said 'For three days the spirit [of the departed] wanders about the sepulchre, expecting if it may return into the body. But when it sees that the form or aspect of the face is changed, then it hovers no more but leaves the body to itself³.' Hence some might argue against Luke's tradition 'The spirit returned to her,' in the story of the raising up of the ruler's daughter. 'This proves nothing'—they might say—'for three days had not elapsed.' But in a case that I shall mention, a sister of the dead man said to Jesus 'Lord, by this time he stinketh, for he hath been [dead] four days⁴.'"

¹ Cramer (on Mt. ix. 24) prints two explanations, (1) "Those who have hope of the resurrection in Christ are not dead but sleep," (2) Jesus "makes light of the work He is about to perform," and "conceals it," afterwards saying "Tell no one." These are attributed to Origen.

² Jn xi. 11, 14.

³ This is a tradition of Ben Kaphra in *Gen. r. 114. 3* (on Gen. i. 10, Wä. p. 504) quoted by *Hor. Heb.* (on Jn xi. 39) with other passages to the same effect.

⁴ Jn xi. 39.

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

As against such objections to the reality of the Synoptic revivification, the effectiveness of the Johannine narrative seems plain, but there is a great deal more that is not plain. First take, in their order, the sentences that follow the message "He whom thou lovest is sick" sent to Jesus by the sisters of Lazarus: (1) "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby," (2) "Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus," and then (3)—what appears to be a *non sequitur*—"When therefore he heard that he was sick, he abode at that time two days in the place where he was."

Still more perplexing are the sentences "Our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep" and "Lazarus is dead," and then the saying to Martha "Thy brother shall rise again," followed by her answer "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day," to which Jesus does not reply with a correction of her misunderstanding, but with words that might still further perplex her, "I am the resurrection and the life.... Whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die." It is difficult, even for those who are confident that all this is right, to explain *how* it is right.

"Surely," we say, "Jesus could not mean, and Martha could not suppose Him to mean, that every disciple of His was immortal. 'Die' must mean spiritual death. 'Rise again' must mean spiritual resurrection. Yet Jesus seems to have been purposing, both then and some days earlier, to raise Lazarus from a literal grave. Then why does John give us the impression that Jesus is, as it were, mystifying the friends and relations of the dead? Why does he not represent Jesus as saying at once, straight out, that He intends to raise Lazarus from the tomb?"

Perhaps we may find some suggestion of an answer to this question in Origen's declaration that the raising of Jairus' daughter, like the raising of Lazarus, was in answer to a request of Jesus, though in neither case is a definite request

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

recorded¹. John seems anxious to warn us against supposing that the Son ever performed a miracle of healing as if it were from Himself, and without some kind of special intercommunication—whether by vision, or by answer to request, to prayer, or to unuttered aspiration—between the Son and the Father. And he leads us to infer that, when Jesus spoke to His disciples about such miracles, signs, or works—resulting in “life,” or “soundness,” or “awakening,” or “rising again”—He often used such language (natural to Him but not natural to them) that they failed to understand it. That is to say, they failed while He was living, but they understood it afterwards when He had died and risen again and sent His Spirit into their hearts. Before that time, Jesus, being in the position of one seeing works performed for Him (as it were) celestially before He performed them terrestrially, was wont to speak about them in the language of heaven to disciples accustomed to the language of earth.

If this is the Johannine view we may find some kind of answer—a partial answer at all events—to the objection “The narrative of the Raising of Lazarus would be much more beautiful if the narrator did not represent Jesus as knowing beforehand all that He purposed to do and yet concealing it from His disciples and from the sisters of the deceased.” Logically we must admit that there would be great force in

¹ Jn xi. 41 “I thank thee that thou heardest me” implies that Jesus had sent forth some request to the Father. But it is not recorded. Origen says (*ad loc.* Lomm. ii. 319) “We must not suppose that the soul of Lazarus was [still] present with the body after the departure [from it], and that, as being [still] present, it quickly heard Jesus when He cried and said, ‘Lazarus! Hither! [Come] outside!’...But I think nearly the same thing came to pass also when He raised up the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue, praying about this (? *περὶ τοῦτον εὐχόμενος*), for He asked that the soul should come-back-again and be caused to dwell again in the body.” The words “praying about this” appear to mean “praying about this [same thing in both cases],” namely, the return of the departed soul.

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

this arraignment if Jesus were to be regarded here and elsewhere in the Gospel as having complete foreknowledge. But is that the case? Does the Fourth Gospel consistently maintain that Jesus (as in the Feeding of the Five Thousand) "knew what he was to do" in every minute detail?

It would be truer to say that Jesus is to be regarded as led by emotion blended with knowledge, and that the emotion that leads Him may be best summed up as filial Love¹. The Son, representing the Love of the Father, is regarded as dependent at every moment on the Father, and as not knowing, not wishing to know, and even perhaps as refusing to know, all the details of that which will come to pass, until the time comes for their performance. He knows that, in some sense, the sickness of Lazarus is "not unto death but for the glory of God." But He awaits further revelation. This seems to come to Him step by step, or by oscillations. All sorts of words describing earthly "love" and "friendship" (the personal affection of Jesus for Lazarus and his sisters), "weeping," "trouble," "groaning" and passionate emotion², are introduced or reiterated in this narrative in such a way as to indicate that we are witnessing a gradual accumulation of human as well as divine emotions, destined to achieve—as it were by natural means, if we take enlarged views of nature—some supreme sign of the vivifying Love of the Father for all mankind.

We have seen above that one ancient comment on the Synoptic words "she is not dead but sleepeth" explains them as proceeding from Christ's desire to disparage His own wonderful work. In the Fourth Gospel, there is no desire to

¹ Not "love" merely, for a dog loves his master, and a babe loves its mother. But the "love" of Christ means love combined with that insight which the Son has into the Father's will, owing to unity of nature.

² E.g. *φιλέω* in Jn xi. 3, 36, *φίλος* in xi. 11 (and *ἀγαπάω* in xi. 5), *ἐμβριμάομαι* in xi. 33, 38. *Κλαίω* is used twice, about Mary and the Jews (xi. 33), *δακρύω* once, about Jesus (xi. 35).

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

disparage, but to express Christ's different moods, at one moment speaking to the disciples in His own language "Our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep," at another in their language "Lazarus is dead." At the same time beneath both of these moods there is the recognition that man's life consists, not in the continued act of material breathing, but in the continued act of spiritual breathing, and this kind of breathing is a loving faith by which man passes through the Son into the Father ("whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die"). This Jesus feels to be a solid reality. Hence it is unnatural for Him to say at first to the disciples about anyone whom He dearly loves "He is dead." He says this afterwards. But it is the language of the nursery. The spiritual truth is "Our friend is fallen asleep," and, at the same time, He receives a special intimation that, even in the popular sense, the "sleep" is only a temporary sleep, so that He adds "But I go, that I may awake him out of sleep."

How far the Raising of Lazarus may be regarded as historical is a most difficult question, not discussed here. If it is historical, then Luke—who mentions the sisters Martha and Mary but makes no mention of their brother, nor of any Lazarus except the beggar raised from the dead to Abraham's bosom—appears to forfeit all claim to be a well-informed biographer of Christ with any sense of proportion. A similar forfeiture, though in a less degree, would seem to be incurred by Mark and Matthew¹.

¹ It has been suggested that the earlier Evangelists suppressed every written account of the raising of Lazarus because of the danger that (Jn xii. 10) the Jews might kill him. No doubt, such a danger might exist in the early days of the Church of Jerusalem. But when Peter and John healed a lame man, though the rulers of the Jews said (Acts iv. 16) "What shall we do to these men? For that indeed a notable miracle hath been wrought through them is manifest to all that dwell in Jerusalem," we do not find them attempting to kill the lame man. And it is hardly probable that at the time when Mark wrote his Gospel—perhaps a generation after the alleged raising of Lazarus—in Alexandria or Rome, he would seriously say

JESUS RESTORING TO LIFE

If it is not historical, it would be best explained, not as fiction, but as narrative deduced from other traditions about Christ's acts of revivification, combined and amplified symbolically in order to shew, in one specimen, the spiritual aspect of such mighty works. But even in that case we may say that the Fourth Evangelist throws light on the Synoptic tradition "she is not dead but sleepeth." It was the custom of Jesus to regard what the world called "death" as being what He called "sleep," but in a special case, where He received an intimation that there was to be an immediate rising up from this sleep, He might mix as it were the two dialects "Not [*what you call*] *death*, but [*what I call*] *sleep* [and a sleep from which there is to be an immediate awakening]."

to himself "We Christians have known for thirty years that Jesus raised a man named Lazarus of Bethany from the dead, but I will not describe it and put down his name on paper—as I ventured to put down the name of Bartimaeus—for it might endanger his life."

If the Synoptists had anticipated any danger for Lazarus, they might have omitted his name, as Matthew and Luke omit the name of Bartimaeus, and as Luke omits the name of the young man whom Jesus raised from the dead at Nain. When John says (xii. 10) "The chief priests *took counsel that they might put Lazarus also to death*," he implies that they did not carry out their "counsel." And he leads us to the inference that after they had killed Jesus it was not worth their while to kill Lazarus. The same thing would be true in after years. Moreover, at the time when Luke wrote, after the fall of Jerusalem, "the chief priests" had no longer the power to kill Lazarus, even if Lazarus was still alive.

CHAPTER V

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

[Mark vi. 1—6 a]

§ 1. *The agreements and disagreements of the Four Gospels*

THIS is one of the very rare occasions where the Fourth Gospel, as will be seen below¹, agrees roughly with the Three

¹ Mk vi. 1—6 a
(R.V.)

(1) And he went out from thence; and he cometh into his own country; and his disciples follow him.

(2) And when the sabbath was come, he began to teach in the synagogue: and *(some anc. auth. insert the)* many hearing him were astonished, saying, Whence hath this man these things? and, What is the wisdom that is given unto this man, and [what mean] such mighty works wrought by his hands?

(3) Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us? And they were

Mt. xiii. 53—58
(R.V.)

(53) And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished these parables, he departed thence.

(54) And coming into his own country he taught them in their synagogue, insomuch that they were astonished, and said, Whence hath this man this wisdom, and these mighty works?

(55) Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joseph, and Judas, and Simon?

(56) And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this man all these things?

(57) And they were offended *(lit. caused to stumble)* in him. But Jesus

Lk. iv. 16—17,
21—24, 28 (R.V.)

(16) And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and he entered, as his custom was, into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up to read.

(17) And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Isaiah . . .

(21) And he began to say unto them, To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears.

(22) And all bare him witness, and wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth: and they said, Is not this Joseph's son?

(23) And he said unto them, Doubtless ye will say unto me this

Jn iv. 43—45
(R.V.)

(43) And after the two days he went forth from thence into Galilee.

(44) For Jesus himself testified, that a prophet hath no honour in his own country.

(45) So when he came into Galilee, the Galilaeans received him, having seen all the things that he did in Jerusalem at the feast: for they also went unto the feast.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

in a few words attributed to Jesus; and there is a general agreement in the thought, namely, that it is difficult for a prophet to obtain full recognition "in his own country." But the verbal variations in the context are of such a kind as to lead early commentators to divergent conclusions as to what the "country of Jesus" was. Luke makes Jesus say that a prophet is not "acceptable" (lit. "*received [with welcome]*") in his own country. John says that the Galilaeans "*received*" Him because they had seen in Jerusalem the miracles that He had done in Jerusalem. Luke represents the hearers of Jesus as saying "The things that we have heard as having been done [by thee] at Capernaum"—not in Jerusalem—"do also here in thine own country." Lastly, Luke deviates from all the

Mk vi. 1—6a
(R.V.) *contd.*

offended (*lit.* caused to stumble) in him.

(4) And Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house.

(5) And he could there do no mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed them.

(6a) And he marvelled because of their unbelief.

Mt. xiii. 53—58
(R.V.) *contd.*

said unto them, A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house.

(58) And he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief.

Lk. iv. 16—17,
21—24, 28 (R.V.)
contd.

parable, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done at Capernaum, do also here in thine own country.

(24) And he said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is acceptable in his own country*.

.....
(28) And they were all filled with wrath in the synagogue, as they heard these things.

* Luke proceeds as follows (iv. 25—30):—

(25) But of a truth I say unto you, There were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when there came a great famine over all the land; (26) and unto none of them was Elijah sent, but only to Zarephath, in the land of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. (27) And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian. (28) And they were all filled with wrath in the synagogue, as they heard these things; (29) and they rose up, and cast him forth out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might throw him down headlong. (30) But he passing through the midst of them went his way.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

Gospels by representing the visit as terminated by an attempt on the part of the audience to cast Jesus down a precipice.

This last fact suggests, as a working hypothesis, that in this narrative Luke, as compared with John, has pursued the same course as in the Calling of the Fishermen¹. That is to say, Luke has combined with the visit to what people would call "his father's house" in Nazareth an account of an attempt on Christ's life made, according to John, later on, and not at Nazareth but in what Jesus would call His Father's House (i.e. the Temple) at Jerusalem². Such an explanation is at all events less improbable than any that would require us to believe that Mark and Matthew, as well as John, either did not know of this attempt on Christ's life at Nazareth, or knew it but concealed their knowledge.

§ 2. "His country" and "his own country," in all the Gospels

Writing in their own persons, the Evangelists say severally, that Jesus came:—(Mark and Matthew) "into *his country*"; (Luke) "to Nazareth where he had been brought up; (John) "into Galilee³." Afterwards, recording the words of Jesus, all of them use the word "*country*"⁴. The Greek word, *patris*, here used for country, occurs rarely in canonical LXX. There

¹ See *Proclamation*, Preface pp. vi—vii, on the Lucan story of the Draught of Fishes.

² Comp. Lk. ii. 49 (R.V. txt) "Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house (*ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου*)?"

³ Mk vi. 1, Mt. xiii. 54 *εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ*, Lk. iv. 16 *εἰς Ναζαρά, ὃς ἦν τεθραμμένος*, Jn iv. 45 *εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν*. Mt. xiii. 54 "in their synagogues (pl.)" is read by the best Latin and Syriac versions. This implies that the translators regarded *πατρίς* as a district, not a city.

⁴ Mk vi. 4 *ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέουσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ*, Mt. xiii. 57 *ἐν τῇ* [W.H. marg. ins. *ἰδίᾳ*] *πατρίδι καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ*, Lk. iv. 24 *ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ*, comp. Jn iv. 44 *ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι*.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

it corresponds mostly to a Hebrew word meaning "kindred," but once to "land of one's kindred¹." It is not limited to a "city." The Syro-Sinaitic Version uses a word that in Syriac may mean either "city" or "region"; but in Aramaic it mostly has the latter meaning, as it always has in Hebrew². Comparing the eight passages of the four Gospels together we see that, beneath all their variations, the *thought* in all of them was of "country" in the sense of "place of rearing," which is usually also "place of kinsfolk." This may be almost said to imply in one word all that Genesis expresses in three, "thy land and thy kindred and thy father's house³."

One might have supposed that all commentators from the first would have agreed that, since *patris* must here have this suggestion of "kinsfolk," the word must mean the region round Nazareth. Jerome takes it so. But he adds "It may however be otherwise understood, namely, that Jesus is despised *in His house and His country, that is, among the people of the Jews*, and that on this account He 'worked few miracles' there, lest they should become absolutely inexcusable. But He works greater signs daily among the Gentiles through the Apostles, not so much in the healing of bodies as in the saving of souls⁴."

This latter view is that of Origen, who says that perhaps the Evangelists (that is, Mark and Matthew) did not say precisely what the *patris* was "because of something mystically signified in the passage concerning the *patris*, namely *the whole of the*

¹ Gesen. 409 *b*, Jerem. xlv. 16 (Heb.) "land of our kindred."

² Gesen. 193 *b* מדינה, *Levy Ch.* ii. 10—11, *Thes. Syr.* 844. Delitzsch, in Mk vi. 1, Mt. xiii. 54, has simply "*his land*," comp. Gen. xii. 1 "Get thee forth from (Heb.) *thy land* (אֶרֶץ אֲבִיךָ) and thy kindred and thy father's house."

³ Gen. xii. 1. This is the first instance of Heb. (sing.) "land" with a possessive suffix. The Greek *πατρίς* does not usually suggest allusion to "kinsfolk." Hence, perhaps, Mk vi. 4 adds συγγενέων and οὐκεί.

⁴ Jerome on Mt. xiii. 58.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

*Jewish [land]*¹." He also interprets "*His sisters, are they not all with us ?*" as meaning "something of this kind, '*They have our thoughts, not the thoughts of Jesus, and they have no strange element of preeminent understanding as Jesus has*.'" Others might agree that *patris*, "native country," meant something larger than "city," but might urge that it ought not to be regarded as including the whole of Palestine but only the northern portion, where Christ's home lay. This would be appropriately represented by "Galilee" which John substitutes.

§ 3. "*And his disciples follow him,*" in Mark

Mark alone inserts that the disciples followed Jesus². He also alone inserts "*the many*" (i.e. the majority) in the next verse: "And when the sabbath came he began to teach in the synagogue, and *the majority*, hearing [him] were astonished⁴." Matthew mentions no disciples and no majority but only "them," i.e. the natives of the *patris* just mentioned: "Having come into his *country* (*patris*) he began to teach *them* in their synagogue (*v.r.* synagogues) so that they were astonished⁵." This "astonishment" is followed both in Mark and Matthew by remarks of the hearers about their familiarity with the

¹ Origen on Mt. xiii. 53—4 appears to use *δλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας* to mean here, not "the whole of [the province of] Judaea," but "the whole of the land and people of the Jews." The context shews that he assumes the Mark-Matthew visit to be distinct from the Lucan visit, which expressly mentions Nazareth.

² Origen on Mt. xiii. 56 *δοκεῖ μοι τοιοῦτόν τι σημαίνειν· τὰ ἡμέτερα φρονούσιν, οὐ τὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ οὐδὲν ξένον ἔχουσιν ἐξαιρέτου συνείσεως ὡς ὁ Ἰησοῦς*. Taken in a literal sense, the words "Are they not all with us?" Mark ("here with us"), could hardly mean anything but that the sisters were (perhaps married and certainly resident) in Nazareth.

³ Mk vi. 1 *καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*.

⁴ Mk vi. 2 *καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες ἐξεπλήσσοντο*. *Οἱ* is inserted by B and L.

⁵ Mt. xiii. 54 *καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ* (Syr. and latt. mostly pl.) *αὐτῶν ὥστε ἐκπλήσσεσθαι αὐτούς....*

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

kinsfolk of Jesus, and then by the statement "And they stumbled because of him."

Obviously Mark does not intend us to suppose that the disciples joined in this disparaging astonishment. He represents the hearers as being, practically, divided into two sections—the disciples, who were not likely to be astonished, and the natives, of whom most¹ were astonished. Matthew recognises no such division.

Luke takes a course difficult to understand until we read his text in the Diatessaron. There we find the Lucan visit to Nazareth divided into two parts separated by a long interval so as to make two distinct visits. In neither visit is there described any division of mind. In the first Lucan visit "*all*" began to bear witness to him and to marvel at the words of grace that were proceeding out of his mouth². In the next Lucan visit "*all*" were "filled with wrath" and tried to kill Jesus³.

John does not—in the present passage describing this particular visit to Galilee—mention any division of opinion. He merely implies that the Galilaeans derived most of their recognition of Jesus from what they had seen of His works in Jerusalem at the feast of the Passover, and that they "received" Him on that account⁴. But if we ask whether elsewhere John recognises divergences of opinion, and changes of mind, and divisions between a majority and a minority—such as Mark obscurely suggests—we shall find that such recognition is frequent. John thrice uses the word "schism" to express this division; and it is not in the "multitude" alone, but also among

¹ "Most" but not all. For Jesus is said to have healed (Mk vi. 5) "a few sick folk." These would hardly disparage Him.

² Lk. iv. 16—22 *a* placed in *Diatess.* § 5.

³ This is in Lk. iv. 23—30 (omitting 22 *b* "and they said, Is not this Joseph's son?"). It is placed in *Diatess.* § 17 following immediately after Mt. xiii. 55—7 (see p. 107 above).

⁴ Jn vi. 45.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

"the Pharisees," and among "the Jews!" The last mention of this "schism" is followed by an attempt to stone Jesus in the Temple.

§ 4. "Were astonished" in Mark and Matthew, how expressed in Luke

The Diatessaron, combining Mark and Matthew, says "He taught them in their synagogues so that they *were perplexed*. And when the sabbath came, Jesus began to teach in the synagogue, and many of those that heard *marvelled*, and said, Whence came these things to this [man]? And many *envied* him, and *gave no heed* to him, but said, What is this wisdom that is given to this [man] that there should happen at his hands such as these mighty works? Is not this a carpenter, son of a carpenter...?" This is a very remarkable accumulation of verbs apparently intended as renderings of Mark's "*were astonished*."

This leads us to consider the uses of the word "astonished" elsewhere in Mark and Luke. One Marcan instance is reproduced by the parallel Luke, but the other Lucan instances are not parallel to a Marcan instance¹. To two other Marcan instances Luke has either no parallel, or one that perhaps

¹ Jn vii. 43 "So there arose a *division* (σχίσμα) in the multitude because of him" (see also the contrast in the context between "the officers" and the Pharisees), ix. 16 "Some therefore of the Pharisees said, This man is not from God... But others said... And there was a *division* among them," x. 19—21 "There arose a *division* again among the Jews... And many of them said, He hath a devil... Others said... Can a devil open the eyes of the blind?" This is followed by a second attempt to stone Jesus (*ib.* 31) "The Jews took up stones again to stone him."

² Lk. iv. 32 is exactly parall. to Mk i. 22 ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. The other instances of ἐκπλήσσομαι in Luke are Lk. ix. 43 ἐξεπλήσσοντο (pec.), Lk. ii. 48 ἐξεπλάγησαν (about the parents of Jesus seeing Him in the Temple).

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

implies Hebrew confusion¹. A third Marcan instance requires special attention:

Mk xi. 18

And the chief priests and the scribes heard it, and sought how they might destroy him: for they feared him, for all the multitude *was astonished* at his teaching.

Lk. xix. 47—8

...But the chief priests and the scribes and the principal men of the people sought to destroy him: and they could not find what they might do; for the people all *hung upon* (lit. *from*) *him*, listening.

Here Matthew begins, as Mark and Luke do, with "the chief priests and the scribes," but goes off into a separate tradition about "the children crying in the temple²." It seems as though Matthew, like Luke, was not satisfied with Mark's commonplace reiteration of "astonished at his teaching," and desired to substitute, or to go back to, some tradition descriptive of the passionate excitement of the multitude. Luke's expression (lit.) "*hung from him*"—rendered by Delitzsch "*clave after him*"—is rather Greek than Hebrew, for the Hebrew "hang" is very rarely used metaphorically³; but the Syriac versions have it here ("hanging on him to hear him⁴").

¹ To Mk vii. 37 ὑπερπερισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο, Luke has no parallel. On Mk x. 26 περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο, Mt. xix. 25 ἀκούσαντες ἐξεπλήσσοντο σφόδρα, Lk. xviii. 26 οἱ ἀκούσαντες, see *Corrections* 392 a, 441, 443, where some Heb. confusion is indicated.

² Mt. xxi. 15—16 "But when the chief priests and the scribes saw the wonderful works... and the children crying in the temple,... they were moved with indignation... And Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read... 'thou hast perfected praise'?"

³ See Gesen. 1067 b on the rare form in Deut. xxviii. 66 "thy life *hung up* [i.e. in suspense] before thee" and Hos. xi. 7 "(lit.) *hung up to*" R.V. "*bent to*" (Gesen. "certainly corrupt"). The more usual form (Gesen. 1067 b foll.) is always literal. In New Heb., "hang from" occasionally means "depend on," "trust" (Levy iv. 645 a, Levy Ch. ii. 539 a).

⁴ The word also occurs in Solomon's Odes iii. 2, on which see *Light* 3673—6.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

The origin of Luke's "*hung from him*" must be discussed in its order, but the parallelism between it and the Marcan "*astonished*" is noted here because we must now call attention to the fact that in the Lucan parallel to the Marcan Visit to Nazareth, where Luke's text mentions "*casting down a precipice*," some Syriac quotations of it mention "*hanging*."

§ 5. "*Cast down a precipice*" and "*hang*," confused in a version of Luke

In the Lucan account of the Visit to Nazareth, the Syro-Sinaitic Version concludes thus: "They were filled with fury, and they put him forth out of the city and brought him even unto the Pharos (?), the hill that their city was built on, so that they might hang him¹." The Greek has *ophrus*, "brow" ("brow of the hill"). *Ophrus* occurs nowhere else in the Greek Bible except where the Hebrew phrase "*the ridge of the eye*" is rendered in LXX by the single word *ophrus*, "brow²." The Hebrew for "*ridge*," there and elsewhere, is *gab*, and Walton's Syriac has it here, "the *gab* of the hill." But further the Hebrew and Aramaic for "*hang*" often represents our "*crucify*" as in Paul's quotation "cursed is he that hangeth on a tree³." And what appears to be a form of the Hebrew *gab* is used by John in a passage describing Jesus as brought out to receive sentence before crucifixion, "at a place called the pavement, but in Hebrew *Gab-batha*⁴."

On this Westcott says "There can be little doubt that this represents *Gab Baitha*, the ridge (back) of the House," i.e. of the Temple; but as the author of *Horae Hebraicae*

¹ Lk. iv. 29 (SS, Burkitt). The word printed "Pharos" represents Gk ὄφρυς, of which it may be a transliteration. SS "hang" corresponds to Gk κατακρημνίσαι, on which see p. 117, n. 1.

² Lev. xiv. 9.

³ Gal. iii. 13, quoting Deut. xxi. 23.

⁴ Jn xix. 13.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

expresses doubt, and Prof. Dalman has recently changed his views on the subject¹, we shall be safer in saying that in the first century *Gab-batha* might be taken by some to mean "*the brow of the House of the Lord*." If so, it might be taken by Christians, ignorant of Jewish usage, in more senses than one. Jews and some Christians would take it as a ridge near the House of the Lord, the Temple, in Jerusalem, but some Christians might take it as *a ridge near the house of the Lord Jesus in Nazareth*. If however the name was found in connection with the "*hanging*" of Jesus, or an attempt at "*hanging*," such a tradition could only be applied to Jerusalem. No one could seriously and permanently maintain that an attempt was made to "*hang*" (that is, to "*crucify*") Jesus in Nazareth.

What therefore would be Luke's natural course if he came to the conclusion that the visit of the Lord Jesus to His home in Nazareth had been misunderstood by Mark-Matthew, and that it really terminated in an attempt to take away His life in a place of which the name meant something like "*the ridge of the hill of the Lord's house*"? We may infer his probable course from what he seems to have done in the analogous case of the Draught of Fishes which he places early, in contrast with John who places it late². There Luke appears to have retained a difficult word *kaleneusa*, but to have interpreted it as meaning, not "*swam to shore*" but "*made signs*," and to have adapted his context accordingly³. Somewhat similarly here, we could explain the difficult Syro-Sinaitic "*hang*" and the difficult

¹ See *Hor. Heb.* on Jn xix. 13 quoting *Jer. Sanhedr.* fol. 18. 3 as possibly to be rendered "*the elders that sit in the upper 'Gab' in the Mount of the Temple*" (lit. *House*). Westcott refers to *Jer. Sanhedr.* 18 d as mentioning "*Gab of the House*." This *Hor. Heb.* does not exactly mention. See Hastings *Dict.* "*Gabbatha*," and Dalman *Words* p. 7.

² See *Proclamation* pp. 1 foll., 35 foll., 91 foll.

³ *Proclamation* pp. 92—3, 97.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

Greek "*precipitate*" by an early confusion between similar or identical Greek words that have both these meanings¹.

That Luke had some textual basis for his account of the attempt on Christ's life in Nazareth seems all the more probable because of the intrinsic improbability of the account, indicating that he could not have invented it. The traditional supposition of a Rock of Precipitation, two miles from Nazareth, is generally abandoned², and no other has been substituted with any probability that could resist the argument "If this *was* the real place, how came it to be supplanted by the false and traditional one?" If Jesus had been stoned just outside the synagogue, and in company with a few disciples to stand round Him, we could understand His escape; but, as Luke relates the story, the escape is manifestly miraculous. Accordingly Ephrem says about it "When they threw Him from the hill, *He flew in the air*," and Aphraates, "He shewed the power of His majesty when *He was thrown from the height into the depth and was not hurt*."

¹ Steph. Thes. iv. 1107 gives κατακρήμνησις as meaning, in the middle, "*dependeo*," "*praeceps dependeo*," but in the active the same thing as κατακρημνίζω "*praecipilem dejicio*." *Ib.* 1944 emends κρημνᾶν ("hang the maiden") into "κρήμναν vel. κρημᾶν." *Ib.* 1950 gives κρημνάω and κρήμνησις as i.q. κρημνίζω, according to Eustathius, but really meaning "hang," and quotes other instances of corruption. Confusion was very natural since κρημνός "precipice" etymologically means "an overhanging place," like the English local term "hanger."

The only other Biblical instance of κατακρημνίζω is in 2 Chr. xxv. 12 κατακρήμνισαν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅκρου τοῦ κρημνοῦ, where Syr. has (but see context "broken in pieces") "venerunt autem omnes vincti calenis (κηλῶν)"—not mentioned in Thes. Syr. 4343.

² *Enc. Bib.* 3359.

³ Burkitt vol. ii. pp. 130, 183. It is worth noting that Luke's first use of ἐκπλήσσομαι occurs in the narrative of the first visit of Jesus to the Temple (Lk. ii. 48) "they were astonished (ἐξεπλήσθησαν)." Mary says to Jesus "Thy father," meaning Joseph. Jesus replies "The [house] of my Father," meaning God. Probably Luke intends to suggest that the parents of Jesus were bewildered and almost out of their minds with astonishment.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

§ 6. *Attempts on Christ's life, in John*

Mark (as also Matthew) describes no open attempt to take Christ's life. There would therefore be no breach of the rule of Johannine Intervention if the Fourth Gospel were equally silent. But John mentions two such attempts. Both of them were made in the Temple, and in both cases the attempt is to stone Him¹. The first of these says that Jesus "*was hidden and went out of the temple.*" Our R.V. text renders this as "*hid himself.*" But there are reasons for retaining the passive rendering: "Luke had described Christ as '*passing through*' the Nazarenes, but had not explained how this was effected. John suggests that it was literal and miraculous, but also that it was typical of a spiritual blinding whereby Christ '*was hidden*' from those who rejected Him²."

There is less difficulty in John's narrative than in Luke's. On the only other Biblical occasion where "stoning" in the Temple is mentioned, a repairing of the Temple is described as going on at the time, so that stones might be lying about³. Such repairs in the Herodian Temple would be frequent, and a reference to the possibility occurs in the Talmud⁴. A sudden rush of the crowd to snatch up such stones on the spot, and the escape of Jesus, hidden in part at all events by the faithful disciples round Him, are very different things from the Lucan picture which describes how a Nazarene crowd seized and conveyed Jesus—apparently by Himself and without a single disciple near Him—to a rock at a distance (traditionally estimated at two miles) from the town, and then how Jesus, "passing through the midst of them, went his way⁵."

¹ Jn viii. 59 (on which see *Joh. Gr.* 2538—43) and x. 31, 39.

² *Joh. Gr.* 2543. ³ Comp. 2 Chr. xxiv. 21 with *ib.* 13.

⁴ See *Hor. Heb.* on Jn viii. 59 quoting *Sabb.* 115 a "R. Jose saith, They whelmed him (a heretic) under a heap of clay. '*Is there any clay in the mountain of the House?*'" Gloss: '*There was mortar, which they used in building.*'"

⁵ Lk. iv. 30.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

§ 7. "Wisdom" and "mighty works," in Mark and Matthew

Mark speaks of "mighty works" as emphatically present, "through his hands [*continually*] coming to pass"; Matthew, omitting this phrase, leaves the time an open question¹. Luke has "Whatsoever we have heard [*as*] having come to pass at Capernaum, do also here in thy country²," as though the speakers spoke of the past, and of things that they knew only by hearsay and hardly believed to be true. John says "The Galilaeans received him having seen all things *whatsoever he had done in Jerusalem* at the feast, for they themselves also had come to the feast³."

This appears to be an instance of Johannine Intervention, so far as concerns the nature of the evidence that led people in Christ's "country" to believe in His "mighty works"; but as regards the mention of "wisdom" by Mark and Matthew we cannot say that John intervenes—at all events verbally and directly. "Wisdom," *sophia*, is a word that he never uses either in his Gospel or in his Epistle. Perhaps he would have shrunk from attributing it to Jesus (except in very special contexts) because it was often associated by many, as by Paul, with "wisdom of word" and with the "wisdom" "sought after" by "the Greeks⁴," largely consisting of the disputations of those who were called "philosophers," i.e. "lovers of wisdom."

The parallel Luke says "All...were marvelling at the *words of grace* that were proceeding out of his mouth," and John, in

¹ Mk vi. 2 Πόθεν τούτῳ ταῦτα, καὶ τίς ἡ σοφία ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τοιαῦται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γινόμεναι; Mt. xiii. 54 Πόθεν τούτῳ ἡ σοφία αὕτη καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις;

² Lk. iv. 23 Ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γινόμενα εἰς τὴν Καφαρναούμ ποίησον καὶ ἔδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου.

³ Jn iv. 45 ἔδιδξαντο αὐτὸν οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι, πάντα ἑρακότες ὅσα ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱερουσολύμοις ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν.

⁴ 1 Cor. i. 17—22 "wisdom of word...the Greeks seek after wisdom."

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

his prologue, repeatedly mentions the "grace" or "*grace and truth*" that abounded in "the only begotten¹." Mark and Matthew never mention "grace." May we then say that John here intervenes for Luke? Not in this passage. There is no thought of real "grace" in the reception of Jesus by the Galilaeans as described by John. For the most part Luke uses "grace" to mean "favour" or "gratitude." And here the "grace" mentioned by Luke in the reception of Jesus by the Nazarenes, "marvelling at *the words of grace* that were proceeding out of his mouth," is no real "grace" at all. It is nothing but an empty sound of "words of grace"—"words" that seemed quite out of proportion to the merit of a prophet who had not done anything in their presence to justify them, so that they elicited from the audience nothing but marvel at the speaker's presumption. The marvel is followed by disparagement ("Is not this the son of Joseph?") and then by an overt act of hostility. In all this there is nothing that resembles the Johannine "grace" that overflowed into the hearts of the disciples from "the only begotten."

§ 8. "*The carpenter,*" in Mark and Matthew²

There is reason to think that "the carpenter" may not have conveyed, in Mark's original, the contemptuous impression that it conveyed to Celsus and would probably convey to the Roman

¹ χάρις, "grace," is peculiar to the third and fourth Gospels (Joh. Voc. 1775 c). But in Luke it mostly means "favour" or "gratitude." In John it means "divine graciousness" (contrasted with Law) abounding in the incarnate Logos from whom it flows forth to those who receive Him: (Jn i. 14—17) "full of grace and truth...from his fulness we all received, and grace succeeding (ἀντὶ) grace...the [gift of] grace and the [gift of] truth (see Joh. Gr. 2284—7, 2301, 2411 e, Son 3566) came into being through Jesus Christ."

² Mk vi. 3 ὁ τέκτων ὁ υἱὸς... , Mt. xiii. 55 ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός. In Mk, some Greek cursives have ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός..., and similarly some Latin codices have "fabri filius."

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

world¹. The Hebrew for "carpenter," a word that means "artificer," whether in wood, or stone, or metal², is sometimes used in the Talmud for a distinguished Teacher³. The word used in the Syriac of Mark and Matthew for "carpenter" is frequently used in the same way in Talmudic treatises. For example, about some difficult critical question, a Rabbi says, "There is *no carpenter and no son of a carpenter*" that could answer it, and another Rabbi, while declaring that he can answer it, adds nevertheless, in modest deprecation, that he is "*no carpenter and no son of a carpenter*."⁴

This appears to have been a frequent phrase, and there is perhaps an allusion to it when it is said "Better is the saying of the *Smith* than that of the *son of the Smith*," where "the *Smith*" is the name given to a Rabbi Isaac and "the son of the *Smith*" is the name given to the celebrated Rabbi Jochanan⁵. Jochanan's early date attests the antiquity of such titles; for he is connected with legal questions that arose before the destruction of Jerusalem, and legend tells that he predicted to Vespasian his future elevation to the imperial dignity⁶.

¹ Origen (*Cels.* vi. 36) quotes Celsus as saying, about Jesus, *τίκτων ἢ τῆς τέχνης* and denies that any Gospel makes this statement. Origen is mostly so accurate that we may pardonably conjecture that he read *τεκτονό* (i.e. *τίκτων δ*) as *τεκτονόκο* (*Joh. Gr.* 2852).

² Gesen. 360 b.

³ Levy ii. 118—9.

⁴ *Aboda Sara* 50 b. See Levy iii. 338 (רנ) who gives other instances of "carpenter and son of a carpenter."

⁵ *Sanhedr.* 96 a. Levy iii. 419 b quotes and renders *Sanhedr.* thus, but refers to *B. Metz.* 85 b "son of the *Smith*" as a name of *R. Isaac*, whereas Goldschm. says, in a note, that it is "a name of *R. Jochanan*." Levy himself says that *Chull.* 77 a "R. Isaac son of the *Smith*" is an error, and refers to *Sabb.* 25 b as one of many instances where *R. Isaac* is called "the *Smith*." Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 14 "Alexander the *Coppersmith* (*χαλκείρ*)."⁶ There Schöttgen says "I do not believe that he was a *smith* (*fabrum*) by trade (*professione*) but that he was a *Rabbi*," and quotes *Joma* 54 b about "*Isaac the Smith*." But Alexander may have been both.

⁶ See Schürer ii. 1. pp. 366—7 referring to *Lam.* 7. on *Lam.* i. 5 (Wü. p. 66 foll.).

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

After the fall of Jerusalem he became the most important of the scribes. It is said of him that he lived one hundred and twenty years, of which the first forty were given to "business"; and although that must not be accepted as literally true, it shews—what we know from other sources—that a training in "business" was regarded as a credit rather than a discredit to the career of an eminent rabbi¹. It may therefore be taken for granted that the title eulogistically applied to him, "son of a Smith," and the (apparently) earlier and more general title "son of a carpenter," together with the rabbinical titles "smith" and "carpenter," were in use before Jochanan's time, and consequently in the days when Jesus came bringing the Gospel to Galilee.

In view of these facts we must clear our minds from the modern notion, which was also the ancient Greek and Roman notion, that there was something disparaging in the name "carpenter" applied to Jesus². We must even prepare our minds to accept the conclusion—astonishing to us perhaps—that it was complimentary, and that it must be taken with what precedes, thus: "Whence hath this man these [gifts]? And what is the wisdom that is given to him?... *Is not this indeed a carpenter* [i.e. *a Chief among the Rabbis*]?" Along with this tradition might go one that Matthew has preferred, "*Is not this a son of a carpenter?*" Both would naturally be soon

¹ On Jochanan's "business" (מֵסֵד, *pragmata*) see Levy ii. 227 *a* quoting *R. hasch.* 31 *b*, and Levy iv. 99 *b*. For other instances (very numerous) see Wagenseil's *Sota* pp. 596—600.

² In his comment on Mk vi. 1 foll., Pseudo-Jerome reads "*filii fabri*," and says, "*et hoc mystice, sed fabri qui fabricatus est Auroram et Solem.*" Origen, as we have seen, denies that Jesus was called a carpenter. The only mentions of τέκτων in Goodspeed are in Justin Mart. *Tryph.* § 88 describing Jesus as "*deemed (νομιζομένου) the son of Joseph the carpenter,*" and as "*deemed a carpenter*" because he wrought the "*works of a carpenter,*" making "*ploughs*" and "*yokes.*" This might mean instruments for the sowing of the seed of the Gospel, but Justin says "*by which He taught the symbols of righteousness and an active life (ἐνεργῆ βίον).*"

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

taken by Greeks to mean "the carpenter, or, the son of the carpenter [whom we all knew in Nazareth]." Of course, all this does not exclude the possibility that Jesus, or Joseph, or both, were actually "carpenters." But it makes highly improbable the usual assumption that the term was employed in the first instance with a sense of disparagement.

On our hypothesis (of non-disparagement), the sentence in Mark—which originally perhaps combined "carpenter" and "son of a carpenter," meaning, in effect, "Is not this a prince of Rabbis?"—corresponds in meaning, though not in words, to a long paraphrase in the parallel Luke "And all bare witness unto him, and wondered at the words of grace that came forth out of his mouth." But Luke has erroneously added to this a more literal but incorrect version of Mark's original, in which he has substituted "*son of Joseph*" for "*son of a carpenter*."

As regards what follows in Mark and Matthew, we may suppose that, in spite of this outburst of superficial admiration for Jesus as a mere popular preacher, the Nazarenes speedily relapsed into the reflection that after all He could not be so very different from His brothers and sisters who were quite ordinary people.

There is something a little grotesque and abrupt in this argument against the claims of Jesus:—"His sisters are here with us, so that he cannot be a very great prophet." Perhaps Luke the historian omitted it—though very true to human nature—because it was grotesque. Mark's context favours the view that he himself interpreted "carpenter" in a disparaging sense. But about that we cannot be sure. We can be sure, however, that, in the first half of the first century¹, a disparagement of "carpenter" that would seem natural to Greeks would seem quite unnatural to Jews.

¹ That is, before the Christian "carpenter" had become recognised by Jews in general as their enemy, and referred to by that name, "the Carpenter," in polemical discussions.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

If "the carpenter" has this metaphorical meaning, we may perhaps say that as Luke has paraphrased it here, so John has paraphrased it elsewhere in passages where the eloquence of Jesus is described as producing an effect on the crowd. But we cannot maintain that there is anything in John corresponding to the Mark-Matthew mention of Christ's "sisters." About Christ's "brethren," of whom Luke makes no mention here, John makes mention elsewhere in terms that describe them as being out of touch with Christ's disciples and not disposed to believe in Him¹. The omission of the names James, Joses, Judas and Simon may perhaps be explained by John's general habit of omitting Synoptic names that are not essential to his narrative². But as to the "sisters" we must admit that John's silence constitutes an instance of exception to the rule of Johannine Intervention.

§ 9. "Offended," in the Synoptists

This narrative ("and they were offended in him") contains Mark's second use of the word "offend³." The first was in the Parable of the Sower, "when...persecution ariseth...they are *offended*⁴." But the discussion of it was deferred to the present occasion, that its meaning in the narrative of the Evangelist might be compared with its meaning in the lips of Christ. The third Marcan instance is transitive, "whosoever shall *offend* one of these little ones⁵." In all these passages A.V. has "offend," but the text of R.V. has "stumble" in the

¹ Jn vii. 5.

² If the sisters of Jesus had "not the thoughts of Jesus" (see p. 111, quoting Origen on Mt. xiii. 56), that might account for their dropping out of view in all but very early Christian records.

³ Mk vi. 3, Mt. xiii. 57. Luke differs.

⁴ Mk iv. 17 *εἶτα γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διαγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται*, Mt. xiii. 21 (sim.) *γενομένης δὲ...σκανδαλίζεται*, Lk. viii. 13 *ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται*.

⁵ Mk ix. 42 (and sim. Mt. xviii. 6, Lk. xvii. 2) *σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων*.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

first of them and "cause to stumble" in the third. It will be convenient to retain "offend" for the most part, with the warning that it is used to mean "cause to stumble," so that "I am offended" means "I am caused to stumble." Luke agrees with Mark-Matthew in the warning not to "offend" a "little one," but never uses the word elsewhere except in the saying "Blessed is he that shall not *be offended* in me," where he agrees verbatim with Matthew¹. He uses it, in all, twice. Yet the word is very freely used by Mark and the parallel Matthew, and also sometimes by Matthew independently.

What induced Luke to avoid this ancient Synoptic word? John, like Luke, uses it but twice. Do John's instances and abstinences throw any light on Luke's motive, and on the meaning, or meanings, of the Greek "offend"? How is it used, if at all, in Greek literature? How in LXX? If there is a Hebrew original, or originals, what are the renderings given by the Targumists and by the Greek translators of the second century? Such are the questions before us.

The Greek for "offend" does not occur in Greek literature. Nor does it occur in the LXX in the transitive ("cause to offend"). It occurs in the canonical LXX once, in the passive, "Many [countries] (R.V.) *shall be overthrown*"². There it represents the passive of a Hebrew word (*câshal*) meaning "stumble." But Theodotion's parallel rendering is "be weak," and the LXX itself has previously rendered *câshal* in the same context, no less than four times, by other words³.

¹ Mt. xi. 6, Lk. vii. 23. This is in the Double Tradition, commonly called "Q." In the Double Tradition, Luke comparatively seldom differs from the Greek of Matthew.

² Dan. xi. 41.

³ R.V. also varies. In Dan. xi. 14 "they shall *fall*," *ib.* 19 "he shall *stumble*," *ib.* 33 "they shall *fall*," Heb. has כָּשַׁל, LXX προσκόπτω. In *ib.* 35 "some of them that be wise shall *fall*," to refine them," LXX has διανοήσονται (confusing כָּשַׁל with שָׁכַל which it renders by διανοήσθαι in ix. 13, 25). In xi. 41 "many [countries] shall be

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

If we ask why such a recondite Greek word as *scandalizein*—rather implying “snare” or “trap”¹—should be used in this single passage, we may perhaps find it in the conception of conquered countries as being caught in the snare of the conqueror. This view is confirmed by two instances in which the Hebrew of Ben Sira gives, for the passive Greek “offended,” a Hebrew original (*yākash*) meaning “ensnared”². The Greek noun *scandalon* mostly corresponds in LXX to two Hebrew nouns, one of them derived from *cāshal*, “stumble,” but the other from *yākash*, “ensnare”³. Both these Hebrew nouns are rendered by one and the same Aramaic noun⁴. It follows that the Aramaic word used by Jesus in His doctrine about “offending” might have a wide significance according to context, sometimes implying a retrievable “stumbling,” but sometimes an “ensnaring” almost, or wholly, irretrievable.

For example, in the Parable of the Sower, where Mark has

ουενηθουν,” LXX has *σκανδαλισθήσονται*. Theod. has always *ἀσθενίω*. For a connection between *ὁ ἀσθενῶν*, *ὁ προσκόπτων*, and *σκάνδαλον*, see Rom. xiv. 1 *τὸν δὲ ἀσθενοῦντα*, *ib.* 13 *μὴ τιθεῖναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον*, *ib.* 20—21 *τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίουσι... ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκόπτει*, xv. 1 *τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων*.

¹ See Steph. *Thes.* vii. 319—20 on *σκανδάληθρον* the “trigger” in a mousetrap, and on *σκάνδαλον* explained by Hesychius as *τὸ ἐν ταῖς μνάγρας*. It is metaph. in Aristoph. *Ach.* 687 “mousetraps (*σκανδάληθρα*) of words.”

² Sir. ix. 5 *σκανδαλισθῆς* (v.g. *σκωδαλίση σε*) (*שריח* from *שרי*), xxxii. (Gr. xxxv.) 15 *σκανδαλισθήσεται* (*שרי*).

³ Gesen. 430 gives the verb *שרי* as “lay a bait,” “lay snares,” and the noun *שריח* as a “bait in a fowler’s net,” and then “snare,” but Job xl. 24 (R.V.) “pierce through his nose with a *snare*” is difficult. A.V. has “[his] nose pierceth through snares,” Rashi explains “snare” as “instrumenta artificialia piscatorum.” *Σκάνδαλον* = *שׁוֹרָח* (from *שריח*) in Lev. xix. 14, 1 S. xxv. 31, Ps. cxix. 165, but *שריח* (from *שרי*) in Josh. xxiii. 13, Judg. ii. 3, viii. 27, 1 S. xviii. 21, Ps. lxi. 22, cvi. 36 etc.

⁴ Onk. has (Brederek) *כְּרִיח* in Lev. xix. 14 “nor put a *stumbling-block* before the blind,” and also in Exod. x. 7 “a *snare* unto us,” xxiii. 33 etc.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

"they are offended," as quoted above, the parallel Luke has a word that would etymologically denote "apostasy¹." Also Hermas—a writer often closely akin to Mark—says "These are they that have faith indeed, but, having also the riches of this world, when tribulation arises, by reason of their riches and their business-affairs *they deny their Lord*²." Something like entanglement in a snare is implied by the context, which speaks of "the deceitfulness of riches³."

Luke does not differ from Mark and Matthew as to the warning against "offending little ones." But he omits the sequel ("If thine eye *offend* thee") and the context—which imply that the flesh, as well as the deceitfulness of riches, can "offend⁴." Also he omits Christ's prediction to the disciples "All ye *shall be offended*," and Peter's protest that he, at all events, will not be "*offended*⁵." Apparently Luke thought *scandalizein*—which he perhaps connected with "ensnaring"—too strong a word to describe the temporary and unpremeditated lapse of Peter and the disciples.

We have now to ask what we can learn from the Johannine use, and non-use, of this word.

¹ In Lk. viii. 13 *οἱ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσιν καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται*, the preceding *πιστεύουσιν* obliges us to supply *ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως* after *ἀφίστανται*, so that it means "depart from [the faith]," i.e. apostatize. Comp. 1 Tim. iv. 1 *ἀποστήσονται τῆς πίστεως*.

² Hermas *Vis.* iii. 6. 5. Comp. Gesen. 430 *b* on *ἔρ*, in Prov. vi. 2, = "ensnared, in business entanglements."

³ Mk iv. 19, Mt. xiii. 22, *ἡ δὲ ἀνάγη τοῦ πλούτου*, parall. to Lk. viii. 14, which does not mention *ἀνάγη*.

⁴ Mk ix. 43 foll., Mt. xviii. 8 foll. Luke also omits Mk xiv. 38, Mt. xxvi. 41, "the flesh is weak (*ἀσθενής*)."

⁵ Mk xiv. 27, Mt. xxvi. 31 (adding "in me"). The parallel Luke has in the context (xxii. 31) *Σίμων, Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς τοῦ σιναῖσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον*. Comp. Dan. xi. 35 "Some of them that be wise *shall fall* (or, *be offended*) to refine them," quoted above (p. 125, n. 3), where LXX has "*shall bethink themselves*."

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

§ 10. "Offended," in John

"Offending" is not mentioned by John till he describes a "murmuring" of "disciples" against Christ's teaching in Capernaum¹. The teaching begins by referring to "the living bread," and proceeds to the gift of Christ's "flesh" and "blood." At first, it is only the Jews that murmur, saying, "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know²?" Then, as the doctrine rises in paradox, "The Jews strove with one another, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat³?" Still it is only "the Jews." But at last, when the climax is reached, "many of his disciples, when they heard [it], said, This is a hard saying; who can hear it⁴?" And now Jesus for the first time introduces the word in question, implying, not indeed that the disciples have already "been offended" but that they are on the brink of it: "Jesus, knowing in himself that his disciples were murmuring about this, said unto them, Is this *offending* you⁵?"

This saying should be read with what comes early in the narrative, namely the purpose of the multitude to make Jesus a king, and also with what concludes the narrative—the saying of Jesus "Was it not I that chose you, the Twelve? And one of you is a devil," followed by the Evangelistic statement

¹ Mk ii. 1 "Capernaum" is parall. to Mt. ix. 1 "his own city." Some confusion might arise from various interpretations of a tradition that "they murmured against Jesus in *His own house*" meaning (*Son* 3460 c) "among His own disciples," but wrongly taken to mean "among His own folk," i.e. in Nazareth, Capernaum or Galilee.

² Jn vi. 42. This resembles the Synoptic comments assigned to Christ's hearers in "his own country" (Mk vi. 3, Mt. xiii. 55, Lk. iv. 22). But John does not say that these Jews "were offended."

³ Jn vi. 52.

⁴ Jn vi. 60.

⁵ Jn vi. 61 τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει; The present tense here seems to have an inceptive force, describing a process that is just, or almost, beginning and is to be arrested.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

"Now he spake of Judas¹." Then it will be seen that the "offending" involves a stumbling at the Law of self-sacrifice, a falling back which Jesus regards as originating from "the ruler of this world," who is already acting on Judas, and, through Judas, attempting to cause the Twelve to "go away" from Him. This falling back is implied in the words "From this [time] many of his disciples *departed backward* and would no longer walk with him. Jesus therefore said to the Twelve, Can it be that even ye desire to *go away*?" This means, in effect, that many of Christ's disciples "*were offended*," in a sense approaching to apostasy or denial of their Master; and the context suggests that Jesus regarded such apostasy not only as being a falling back from the Son of God but also as indicating a tendency to follow after, or worship, Satan, "the ruler of this world²."

In the same serious sense does Jesus repeat the word "offended" to His disciples, when He warns them, on the night before the crucifixion, of the persecution that awaits them. "These things have I spoken unto you that *ye may not be offended*...whosoever killeth you shall think that he doeth service to God³." In word, this almost amounts to a contradiction of the Mark-Matthew tradition "All ye shall *be offended*⁴." But it is not a contradiction in thought. Only John expresses the Synoptic thought differently, thus: "The

¹ Jn vi. 15, *ib.* 70—71.

² Jn vi. 66—7 ἀπηλθόν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω...ὑπάγειν implies that εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω should be repeated after ὑπάγειν. In the Parable of the Sower, where Mark iv. 17 has "they *are offended*," the parall. Luke viii. 13 ἀφίστανται is rendered by Delitzsch "they *depart backward*."

³ Such "following" is not mentioned here, but it seems to be implied by the context. Several passages of the Gospels and Epistles teach us that men must serve one of "two masters," and that Satan claims authority over all the kingdoms of the earth and offers it to those who worship him; and Jesus Himself recognises that, in some sense, Satan is "ruler of this world" for those who do not accept the Son of God as having "overcome the world."

⁴ Jn xvi. 1—2.

⁵ Mk xiv. 27, Mt. xxvi. 31.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

hour cometh, yea, is come, that *ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone*¹." That is to say, the "stumbling," or "being offended," of Peter and the Twelve was not to be a deliberate going backward from Christ, or a going after Satan, like the treachery of Judas. Against that Jesus took measures to secure them. But He could not secure them against a flight for safety, caused by temporary panic, like the temporary "stumbling," predicted in Daniel, which was to befall even some of "the wise," in order to "refine" them².

Concerning that other kind of "stumbling" in which a man causes others to "stumble" or "be offended" John says nothing in his Gospel, but he probably refers to it in the Epistle, as follows "He that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother is in the darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is no *scandalon*, i.e. *stumbling-block*, or *cause-of-offence*, in him³." This resembles the words of the Psalmist "Great peace have they that love thy law, and *there is no stumbling-block to them*⁴." But the Psalm, which has "*to them*," means simply (as A.V.) "Nothing shall offend them." The Epistle, which has "*in him*," enlarges the meaning: "In him there is no cause of stumbling [either for himself or for others]."

In the Epistle, "he that loveth his brother" is assumed also to love God as Father, so that there is a chain of causes and effects:—(1) "love of the Father," (2) "love of the brethren," (3) "light," (4) "no stumbling-block." Antithetical to this, there would be (1) "idolatry" or homage to "the ruler of this

¹ Jn xvi. 32.

² Dan. xi. 35. On the startling words peculiar to Matthew (xvi. 23, addressed to Peter) *σκάνδαλον εἰ ἐμοῦ*, see *Joh. Gr.* 2566 c. They are omitted by the parall. Mk viii. 33, which will be discussed later on.

³ 1 Jn ii. 9—10 *σκάνδαλον ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν*. "Is" is emphatic, "Cause-of-stumbling, in him, has no existence."

⁴ Ps. cxix. 165 *οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῖς σκάνδαλον*.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

world," (2) "hate of the brethren," (3) "darkness," (4) "stumbling." Similarly, in Ezekiel, stumbling is connected with idolatry: "Son of man, these men have *taken their idols into their heart, and put the stumbling-block of their iniquity* before their face¹." Jewish tradition explains Ezekiel's peculiar doctrine connecting "stumbling-block" and "iniquity," as referring to the unmasking of "hypocrites²." Thus, although John never uses the Synoptic word "hypocrite," we perceive, through Ezekiel, that John expresses a condemnation of the *thing*, in words of his own that help us to realise what the thing is.

John also helps us to think for ourselves in an intelligent and Christian spirit about the meaning of another important Biblical word, namely, "desire"—such "desire" as is the cause of "stumbling." Mark says, in the Parable of the Sower, somewhat obscurely, that the good seed is choked by "the desires concerning the remaining things³." This might be regarded as meaning that "desire," in itself, is evil. And Paul might be regarded as meaning the same thing when he (too briefly) quotes the Law as saying "Thou shalt not *desire*⁴."

¹ Ezek. xiv. 3.

² See *Son 3553 i*, quoting Ezek. iii. 20 ("if he commit iniquity and I lay a *stumbling-block* before him") with Rashi "He does his own deeds in secret, and shews himself off as just," and with *Joma 87 a* which infers that "*hypocrites* are to be *unmasked*." Comp. Jn iii. 19—20 "men loved the darkness rather than the light, for their deeds were evil. For everyone that doeth ill hateth the light and cometh not to the light lest his deeds should be reproved."

³ Mk iv. 19 *αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ* (Delitzsch חֲבֵרֵי הַדְּבָרִים) ἐπιθυμίας. There is perhaps some error. In LXX, *λοιπὰ* is represented by *σὰρξ*, which also means "flesh," and by *ἄνωγος* which also means "superfluous." Either of these words would make better sense than *λοιπὰ*.

⁴ Rom. vii. 7, and xiii. 9 where it is quoted after "thou shalt not steal," without any modifying words such as are given in Exod. xx. 17 "Thou shalt not desire *thy neighbour's house* . . ." The Targum uses the Heb. in Exod., חָסַד, in a bad sense (as it is always used in Aram.), but in Heb. (Gesen. 326) it is sometimes used in a good sense. Paul uses *ἐπιθυμίας*, briefly, in a bad sense. But in LXX and

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

The Law did not forbid "desire." It merely forbade *desire of that which belongs to one's neighbour*. All God's fatherly gifts, the visible as well as the invisible, may rightly be "desired," and may come to a man with the divine blessing, increasing his love for the Giver and Father.

The only Johannine mention of desire is in Christ's saying to the Jews, "Ye are from [your] father the devil, and *the desires of your father it is your will to do*¹." The Jews had just protested, "We were not born of fornication², we have one Father, even God." Jesus is contradicting their protest. The many "desires" of Satan are here tacitly contrasted with the will of the "one Father." And love, as in the Epistle, so in the Gospel, is made the test that convicts the hypocritical idolater, who worships Satan in worshipping himself: "If God were your Father ye would love me."

Thus, in order to explain and reinforce the Synoptic negative doctrine, which warns us against "stumbling" or "being offended," or against "offending" others, the Fourth Gospel gives us a positive doctrine about love, and peace, and the unity of man with the Father through the Son—which make all stumbling impossible. Where the Psalmist says "*Great peace have they that love thy Law*, and there is no occasion of stumbling to (or, for) them," John, in effect, teaches us, in the place of "thy Law," to read "thy Son." Moreover, he leads us to substitute, for the negative "no occasion of stumbling," the positive "peace." For he brings Jesus before us as saying,

N.T. it often has a good sense. See Origen *Comm. Joann.* xx. 20 (Lomm. ii. 246) κατὰ τὰς θείας γραφὰς ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῶν μίσεων ἐστίν.

¹ Jn viii. 44.

² See Ezek. xvi. 15, 26, etc. on this metaphor. Comp. Clem. Alex. 551—2 on πλεονεξία as being called πορνεία, and as being opposed to αὐτάρκεια. He adds καὶ ὡς εἰδωλολατρεία ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπινέμησις ἐστὶ θεοῦ, οὕτως ἡ πορνεία ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς γάμου εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐστὼ ἑκπτώσις.... A thought of this kind is latent in Jn iv. 17—18 "thou hast had five husbands" and comp. Philo i. 131 on the "seducer (φθορεὺς)" who acts through the five senses.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

at first negatively, "These things have I spoken unto you *that ye may not be made to stumble*," but afterwards, positively, "These things have I spoken unto you *that in me ye may have peace*. In the world ye have tribulation, but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world¹."

§ II. "Not without-honour," in Mark and Matthew²

The Greek adjective, *atimos*, here applied to a "prophet" and rendered by R.V. "without honour," was often applied to persons by Attic writers, but only in the sense of "disfranchised." And Greek writers in general used it to mean "dishonoured" rather than "without honour³." Origen explains the word as implying "*treating as an outlaw*," "*persecuting*," and as referring to the treatment of Christ by the

¹ Jn xvi. 1, 33.

Space has not allowed us to discuss John's use of *προσκόπτειν*—which expresses "stumbling" without conveying any notion of "ensnaring." It is not used by the Synoptists except in Mt. iv. 6 and Lk. iv. 11 (both quoting Ps. xci. 12) and Mt. vii. 27 ("*smote upon that house*"). It occurs in Jn xi. 9—10 "Are there not twelve hours in the day? If a man walk in the day he *stumbleth* not.... But if a man walk in the night he *stumbleth*"—uttered by Jesus when resolving to go into Judaea, at the peril of His life, in order to raise Lazarus from death.

The Johannine passage seems to mean that even if a man dies while attempting to do God's work in God's appointed work-time of "twelve hours," he does not really "stumble (*προσκόπτει*)."¹ As to the "twelve hours," see *Pesikt.* (Wü. p. 173, a Midrash on Cant. viii. 1) where Joseph says to his brethren that he is bound to help them, for it would be against the course of nature to do otherwise: "Ye represent the course of the world. *The day hath twelve hours, the night hath twelve hours...* can I alter the course of the world?" Another version (quoted in Wü. *ib.* p. 173 n.) adds "My father [*i.e.* Jacob] begot you, and shall I bury you?"

² Mk vi. 4, Mt. xiii. 57 οὐκ... ἄτιμος, Lk. iv. 24 οὐδεὶς... δεκτός...

³ With a negative, and applied to things, "*not dishonourable*" may mean "*honourable*," but the *Thesaurus*, which gives no instance of this applied to persons, quotes only (col. 2377) Aesch. *Sept.* 589 οὐκ ἄτιμον ἀπὸ τοῦ μόρου.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

Jews as a whole¹. In the LXX it represents Hebrew words thrice—once "without-name" and once "lightly-esteemed²." In the third instance, where Isaiah says, of the Suffering Servant, "*he was despised*," the LXX says "*his form was without-honour (atimon)*³." This is a passage that has greatly influenced early Christian literature.

Justin Martyr represents Trypho the Jew as saying "Your so-called Christ was *atimos* and *without-glory (adoxos)*, so that he actually incurred the extreme curse [contained] in the Law of God, for he was crucified⁴." But this is, so to speak, a trap made for Trypho to fall into. For Justin replies at once that this argument might have held good, but for the prophecy that he, Justin, had previously quoted: "If I had not explained from the scriptures that I quoted above that *His form would be without-glory* and his generation inexpressible. . . ." Justin is referring to Isaiah's description of the Suffering Servant, which he has previously quoted in full, and which contains many references to the absence of "glory⁵." Justin does not on this occasion repeat the word "*atimos*." Elsewhere *he repeatedly uses it with allusion to this prophecy, as referring to Christ's first Advent, but almost always inserts some phrase denoting that the "atimia" was temporary and earthly, referring merely to outward "form," "appearance," or "presence."* Nowhere does he say—what he makes Trypho say—that Christ Himself was "*atimos*⁶."

¹ Origen on Mt. xiii. 57 (Lomm. iii. 47—51) uses ἀτιμάω and ἀτιμία repeatedly. Moses, he says (ib. 49) ἡτιμώθη among his countrymen when they tried to stone him, "And his 'country' was not the stones of this or that place [i.e. city] but those following him, the people."

² Job xxx. 8, Is. iii. 5.

³ Is. liii. 3 נִיפְּ (nif. of נִפַּח), LXX ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἀτιμον, Sym. ἡξουδενωμένος.

⁴ Justin Martyr Tryph. § 32 ἀτιμος καὶ ἀδοξος γέγονεν . . . ἐσταυρώθη γάρ.

⁵ Tryph. § 13, quoting Is. lii. 14 foll. (LXX) οὕτως ἀδοξήσει . . . τὸ εἶδος καὶ ἡ δόξα σου . . . οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος αὐτῷ οὐδὲ δόξα . . .

⁶ Justin quotes ἀτιμος in Apol. § 50 and alludes to it in ib. § 52 (with ὅς), Tryph. §§ 14, 36, 49, 85, 100, 110, 121.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

It has been shewn that the Hebrew in Isaiah, corresponding to LXX "*his form was without-honour (alīmon)*," is "he was despised," and is rendered by Symmachus "[he was] set at naught¹." "Set at naught" is applied by Mark alone to the sufferings of Christ as predicted by Jesus², and by Luke alone to the contumelious treatment of Christ by Herod³. When the Hebrew of Isaiah repeats "he was despised" in the same verse, the LXX renders it "he was dishonoured⁴." This word occurs in Christ's words—apart from parables—only once in the Gospels, "I honour my Father and ye dishonour me," uttered shortly before the attempt of the Jews to stone Him⁵.

These facts give us glimpses into the reasons that might induce early Christians to use, or not use, the word *alīmos* in the description of Christ's reception by His own people. The use of it might seem to Mark (followed by Matthew) to point to a fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy. But to the later Evangelists—conveying as it did to Greeks the sense of civic degradation—the word might seem inappropriate to the circumstances. The circumstances might fairly be said to warrant no more than this—a complaint that a prophet, in his own neighbourhood, did not find (1) "*a favourable reception*" or (2) "*honour*." Of these two interpretations, Luke adopts the former, John the latter⁶.

¹ Is. liii. 3 Sym. *ἡξουδενωμένος*. "He was despised" is repeated later in the same verse, and similarly rendered by Aq. *ἡξουδενωμένος*.

² Mk ix. 12 *ἡξουδενηθή* (om. by parall. Mt. xvii. 12; Lk. omits the whole).

³ Lk. xxiii. 11.

⁴ LXX *ἡτιμάσθη* (not *ἡτιμώθη*), Aq. *ἡξουδενωμένος*.

⁵ Jn viii. 49 *ἀτιμάζετε* followed by (viii. 59) "they took up stones." *Ἀτιμάζω* occurs nowhere else in the Gospels except in the Parable of the Vineyard, Mk xii. 4 parall. to Lk. xx. 11 in connection with "wounding in the head" or "scourging."

⁶ Lk. iv. 24 "No prophet is *acceptable* (or [*favourably*] *received*) (*δεκτός*)," Jn iv. 44 "a prophet...hath not honour (*τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει*)."
Jn iv. 45 "the Galilaean *received* (*εδέξατο*) him" seems, at first sight, a complete contradiction to Luke. But John goes on to say

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

No new spiritual truth emerges from these Lucan and Johannine corrections of the ancient Mark-Matthew tradition about *αἰῶμος* as applied to the Saviour. But they exemplify the difficulties of rendering the Gospel into Greek in the earliest days of the Church. They help us to realise cross-currents of Greek and Jewish thoughts, meeting and jostling each other in Christian interpretations of the Prophets, and especially of Isaiah, when prophecy became the basis—not avowed but latent—of Evangelistic expression¹.

Moreover the Fourfold Tradition at this point is also of special interest as an instance of Johannine Intervention, because John does not exactly support Mark against Luke, but rather explains Mark, and, as it were, apologizes for him. Indeed, as to the meaning of the text, he seems to correct Mark in a Lucan direction, but he does it with the minimum of verbal alteration, as if saying: "Luke substitutes '*acceptable*' for

that the reason why they "*received*" Him was that they had been to Jerusalem and had seen the wonders that He had performed there. This suggests the thought: "If the Galilaeans '*received*' Jesus, it was not as '*neighbours*' receiving a prophet belonging to their '*neighbourhood*,' but because some of their number had reported at home what He had done away from home, in Jerusalem."

Comp. Lk. iv. 23 "Whatsoever we have heard done *at Capernaum*, do also here in thine own country." Luke's tradition resembles John's, but with important differences. (1) In Luke, the Nazarenes are regarded as murmuring because the works reported to have been done elsewhere were not done in their presence; in John, the Galilaeans are regarded as receiving Jesus because of those works. (2) In Luke, the "elsewhere" is Capernaum; in John, it is Jerusalem.

¹ The word *αἰῶμος* (sing.) does not occur in the Early Fathers except Clem. Rom. § 16, and there as a quotation from Isaiah liii. 3 (LXX). [The pl. *αἰῶμοι* occurs only in Clem. Rom. § 3 as a quotation from Is. iii. 5, where LXX has sing.] In the early Apologists, it does not occur except as quoted above from Justin Martyr—where, with the exception of one pl. instance (*Apol.* § 9 *αἰῶμων . . . σκευῶν*, comp. Rom. ix. 21 *ὁ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκευῶς, ὁ δὲ εἰς αἰμίαν*), it practically always alludes to Is. liii. 2—3. Clem. Alex. 252 explains Is. liii. 3 *αἰμίον εἶδος* as referring merely to Christ's outward appearance.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

Mark's '*not-honourable*,' which, for Greeks, often means 'disfranchised.' Luke is quite right. But the same result may be effected by a less violent change, simply altering '*is not-honourable*' into '*has not...honour*.'"

§ 12. "*And he was not able to do there any mighty work,*" in Mark¹

Origen in his commentary on the parallel Matthew ("and he did not many mighty works there") calls attention to Mark's words "He did not say '*was not willing*,' but '*was not able*'; for there had to come toward the energizing mighty work a joint-action from the faith of him on whom the mighty work was energizing....²" Luke's context differs so widely from Mark's that we cannot attach much importance to his omission of "was not able." But Matthew's omission of the Marcan "*was not able*," in the midst of an otherwise Mark-following narrative, makes the passage conspicuously suitable for testing the Rule of Johannine Intervention.

John not only adopts the bold saying but also extends its application and places it in the mouth of Jesus Himself: "*The Son is not able to do anything from himself—[anything] except he see the Father doing something*; for such things as he [*i.e.* the Father] is doing, these things also the Son likewise doeth³." These words, though applicable to all action on the part of the Son, and though applied later on to the action of "judging⁴,"

¹ Mk vi. 5 καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν... Mt. xiii. 58 καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ δυνάμεις πολλὰς... Lk. omits the whole.

² Origen on Mt. xiii. 58 ὥς ἐρχομένης μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐνεργοῦσαν δύναμιν συμπράξεως ὑπὸ πίστεως ἑκείνου εἰς ὃν ἐνέργει ἡ δύναμις... He adds that this is "hindered from energizing by the [man's] faithlessness (καλυπτομένης δὲ ἐνεργεῖν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀπιστίας)." Thus the light may fall on our eyes, but it is "hindered from energizing" if we keep them closed. There is a need of our σύμπραξις, *i.e.* opening our eyes.

³ Jn v. 19.

⁴ Jn v. 30 "I am not able from myself to do anything; as I hear, I judge."

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

refer primarily to the healing of a man on the sabbath. What Origen said about the necessity of a "*combined-action (sumpraxis)*" if a "mighty work" was to be performed, John also teaches—but with a difference. Origen spoke of the "combined-action" of the sick man and his Healer. John speaks of the simultaneous action of the Son and the Father, who gives to the Son insight into the condition of the diseased man and a power—or perhaps we should say a command—to heal his disease. The Father appears to be regarded as saying to the Son about this or that particular sufferer: "This man has faith to be healed by thee; or this man has the germ or spark of faith ready to spring into flame at thy word: I give thee this man to heal." This is not inconsistent with Origen's view of *sumpraxis*. But it is wider, and deeper; and it helps us to understand the cure at the pool of Bethesda, where the sufferer was hardly capable of "combined action" in any degree at first, and only in a slight degree even after he had been healed, since he did not know who had healed him.

If we pursued this subject further, discussing the Marcan doctrine about what God or man was "*able*" to do, or about what was "*possible*," we should be carried on to much later periods in the Gospel narrative. Suffice it to say, here, that Mark, in such sayings as "All things are *possible* to him that believeth" and "All things are *possible* unto thee¹," has committed himself to traditions that are probably historically accurate and of great spiritual value, but at the same time liable to be misunderstood and perverted by opponents of the Christians. Epictetus declines to read the discussions of the Greek philosophers about "things-possible." On that subject, if any one asks him, "Which of these tenets do you hold?" he says he shall reply "I do not know²"; he also ventures

¹ Mk ix. 23, xiv. 36, not in the parallel Matthew-Luke.

² Epict. ii. 19. 5—9. The words (*ib.* 9) "Chrysippus has written wonderfully [well] in the First Book on Things Possible (*ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ περὶ δυνατῶν*)" are uttered to Epictetus, not by Epictetus.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

to say that Zeus "*was not able*" to persuade all men to believe the truth, and even to introduce Zeus as saying "*If it had been practicable*, Epictetus, I would have done so-and-so for you¹."

In taking this view, Epictetus is not so far removed from Hebrew thought as we might at first sight assume. The word "Almighty," so frequent in our English Versions of the Old Testament, represents, in Hebrew, "*Shaddai*," which would almost certainly be regarded by Jews in the first century as implying "the Giver of Good." In the LXX, "*Almighty*" (*Pantokrator*)—besides rendering "*Shaddai*"—is also used to render "*of Hosts (Sabaoth)*" in "the Lord of Hosts." Neither of these Hebrew titles denotes "almightiness²."

John's method of dealing with this difficult, this insoluble, question³—of things "possible" and "impossible" for the Son of God—may be stated, first, in its negative, then in its positive, aspect. Negatively, the Evangelist avoids the use of the words "*possible*," "*impossible*," and of the kindred word for miracle, which we render "*mighty-work*" (but which might also mean "*potentiality*," so that to a Greek it is connected with the thought of possibility⁴). Also, whereas all the Synoptists use the verb signifying ability or possibility, "*to be able*," without a negative, in the leper's petition to Jesus, "If thou

¹ Epict. iv. 6. 5, i. 1. 10; εἰ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ.

² See παντοκράτωρ in *Oxf. Conc.*, also Notes 2998 (xxvii) f—m on "Almighty," and Son 3120 a—c, 3123 a.

³ Note that the first use of ἀδύναμις in LXX is in Gen. xviii. 14 (Heb.) "Is any thing (*lit. word*) too hard for (*lit. from*) the Lord?" This refers to the promise of a son previously made to Sarah, so that the meaning of "word" might here be "*word [of promise]*." But the Targumists, both Onkelos and Jer. Targ., have "Is any thing concealed from the Lord?" and Rashi adopts it (though Gen. v. *ad loc.* does not).

⁴ That is to say, δύναμις. John does not use δύναμις, "*mighty-work*," or δυνατός, "*possible*," or ἀδύνατος, "*impossible*." All the Synoptists, besides frequently using δύναμις, use ἀδύνατος and δυνατός in Mk x. 27, Mt. xix. 26, Lk. xviii. 27.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

wilt, *thou art able* to cleanse me¹," John never uses the verb except with a negative, or an interrogative implying a negative. With a negative, he applies it, as we have seen, to the Son "The Son is *not able* to do...", "I am *not able* to do²."

So much for the negative point of view. From the positive point of view, Christ's miracles in the Fourth Gospel are regarded as "*signs*" or as works "*given*" to the Son by the Father. John introduces them as "*signs*" without telling us, at the moment, what they are signs of: "This beginning of *signs* did Jesus." But the following words, "and manifested his glory³," explain how they are "*signs*." The first Biblical mention of "*signs*" refers to the heavenly bodies. They were created "for *signs*" as well as "for seasons," and part of their work, as "*signs*," was to make "the heavens declare the glory of God⁴." So the "*signs*" of Jesus declared the glory of the Father through the Son.

These "*signs*" were also gifts, and Jesus calls them "the works that the Father *hath given me*⁵." He also repeatedly describes as "*given*" to Himself those whom He has spiritually healed, and brought into the circle of His disciples. "All that which the Father *giveth* me will come unto me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out⁶." In effect, the Fourth Gospel may be said to substitute for "God Almighty" "God the Giver." The Father gives His Son to die for the world; He also gives the Church to the Son; and when the Son prays to the Father for the disciples "Keep them in *thy name that thou hast given me*⁷," it is implied that the relation between the Father and the Son is not only one of perfect unity, but also one in which God the Father is to be regarded as giving Himself

¹ Mk i. 40, Mt. viii. 2, Lk. v. 12, all having *δύνασαι*.

² Jn v. 19, 30.

³ Jn ii. 11.

⁴ Gen. i. 14, Ps. xix. 1.

⁵ Jn v. 36.

⁶ Jn vi. 37. See *Joh. Gr.* 2740 on *πάν ὃ δέδωκας* in Jn.

⁷ Jn xvii. 11.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

to the Son and the Son as giving Himself to the Father, and in both cases the gift is for the sake of man.

Reviewing this Johannine doctrine we perceive that John does not attempt to reconcile the Creator's foreknowledge and almightiness with the existence of sin in His human creatures. He ventures to represent Jesus as saying "*Was it not I that chose you the Twelve? And one of you is a devil*"; and, later on, to the Twelve, "*I speak not of you all, I know whom I chose; but—that the scripture might be fulfilled, 'He that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me'*"; and, later still—when Judas had gone out—"I chose you, and appointed you that ye should go and bear fruit... *I chose you out of the world*¹." We are not told when Judas began to become "a devil." The Evangelist perhaps assumes that, when Judas was first "chosen," he was a sincere follower of Jesus, but that, when the doctrine of self-sacrifice was proclaimed, the "hard saying" repelled him, and he fell back into a darkness that became antagonism to his Master. All this, however, is not stated. We are left to infer it from what we are told later on, that Christ's "choosing" was for a certain purpose, to be fulfilled by the person chosen, namely, to "*bear fruit*." If the chosen one, the branch in the Vine, does not "*bear fruit*," then the Husbandman "*taketh it away*²."

This might lead us to say, "Then the Evangelist commits himself to the view that God's 'election' is not absolute." But this, if true, would not be the whole truth or a fair statement of the truth. It would be truer to say that he leads his readers to refrain from committing themselves to any views about "election" that might interfere with their trust in divine love and righteousness, and their sense of a consequent responsibility and duty to make a return—which their consciences

¹ Jn vi. 70, xiii. 18, xv. 16—19.

² Jn xv. 2 "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh it away."

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

tell them they can make—of human love and human righteousness. He uses the term “electing” in different senses—perhaps deliberately—now including, now excluding Judas.

Not improbably John has Synoptic usage in mind. Mark, alone of the Synoptists, uses the strong phrase “*the elect whom he [i.e. God] elected*¹”; Luke, alone of the Synoptists, describes Jesus as “*having elected twelve*” out of the mass of the disciples². Mark’s phrase would probably exclude Judas; Luke includes him. John, in two of the three passages in which he describes Jesus as avowing that He “chose” or “elected” disciples, represents Him as including Judas and as presaging evil (“one of you is a devil,” “but—in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled³”). The third passage drops all presage except of good (“I chose you...that ye should go and bear fruit...I chose you out of the world⁴”). None the less, since they are still to be, locally and actively, “in the world,” He prays for them to the Father: “I pray not that thou shouldst take them from the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil [one]⁵.”

This doctrine teaches all of us—even those of us who are most confident that they belong to “the elect”—to feel that we need this prayer of the Saviour in our behalf. We are to fix our thoughts not on His constraining “might” but on His constraining “love.” Love cannot constrain by anything except by itself. Not even the Love of the Father in heaven

¹ Mk xiii. 20. Comp. Mk xiii. 22 “to deceive, if [it were] possible, *the elect*,” where Mt. xxiv. 24 adds “*even*” before “*the elect*” (Luke omits the whole). Clem. Alex. 969 (*Fragm.*) says that “the men of the calling (τοὺς μὲν τῆς κλήσεως ἀνθρώπους) will be led astray at the coming of Antichrist, but it is impossible for the elect, wherefore He says ‘*even, if [it were] possible, my elect.*’”

² Lk. vi. 13, ἐκλεξάμενος. The parall. Mk iii. 13—14, Mt. x. 2 do not use ἐκλέγομαι.

³ Jn vi. 70, xiii. 18.

⁴ Jn xv. 16—19.

⁵ Jn xvii. 15.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

"is able to do any mighty work" in a heart that will not receive the Spirit of His Son.

§ 13. "*And he marvelled because of their unbelief,*"
in Mark¹

Matthew (as well as Luke) omits this. The Greek word in canonical LXX, when meaning "marvel," often implies astonishment or dumb dismay². In Greek literature its meaning varies. Pythagoras said that the fruit of philosophy was to "*wonder at nothing*," and Plutarch protests against the abuse of this maxim by "many³." It has probably influenced Horace, Epictetus, and Seneca, in their use of the word or its Latin equivalent⁴. In *Johannine Vocabulary* it is shewn that John mostly, if not always, uses the word in a bad sense⁵. That being so, we ought not to expect him to intervene verbally in behalf of Mark. And, as a fact, he nowhere describes Jesus, on any occasion, as "marvelling." Are we then to say that this is a case where, owing to special verbal circumstances, the rule of Johannine Intervention is broken? *

Possibly it is so. But it is worth noting that, on the only other occasion (beside this Marcan one) where Synoptic writers describe Jesus as "marvelling," the "marvel" is represented by Matthew and Luke (not by Mark, who omits the narrative) as being caused, not by "*unbelief*" (as here in Mark) but by "*belief*." This coincidence (or we may call it anticoincidence?) leads us to ask whether Hebrew Prophecy on any occasion represents the Lord Himself as "marvelling"; and, if so, how the Greek translators rendered the Hebrew; and whether the

¹ Mk vi. 6.

² See *Oxf. Conc.* (excluding the phrase *θαυμάζω πρόσωπον*).

³ Plutarch *Mor.* 44 c (*De Audiendo*, § 13).

⁴ See Schweig. *Epict.* i. 29. 3, quoting Hor. *Epist.* i. 6. 1 "*Nil admirari*," and Seneca *Epist.* 45 praising "*mirabilia calcantem*."

⁵ *Joh. Voc.* 1673 a—b.

⁶ Mt. viii. 10, Lk. vii. 9. The marvel is caused by the "faith," or "belief," of a centurion.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

context may have any bearing on our Marcan passage; and further, by what indirect means John might approximate to a representation of the Messiah as in some sense "marvelling" even though he could not bring himself to use the word.

Isaiah twice uses the word concerning the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, at the moment when the nation had gone astray from "judgment"; "The Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no judgment; and he saw that there was no man, and *marvelled* that there was no intercessor," whereupon the Lord Himself "put on righteousness as a breastplate" to come to their help¹. The Septuagint (but not Aquila) misrenders this; so does the Targum; Jewish comment (such as there is) suggests a various reading for "*marvelled*," or explains it as meaning "*was silent*"².

John nowhere represents Jesus as being "silent," or as being silenced by "astonishment," in view of human "unbelief." On the contrary, in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus appears to regard inability to believe as necessary in some men—the men being what they are. Emphasizing "ye" as if it were "ye of all people"—Jesus says to the Jews "How are ye able to believe, [ye] who receive glory one from another and seek not the glory that cometh from the only God?" And John, in his own person, says about them "For this cause *they were not able to believe*," namely, because they were blinded to the glory and love of God by their love for the glory of men⁴. Having written about Jesus, early in the Gospel, "He knew what was in man," John could not consistently describe Him as "astonished" by what He "knew."

¹ Is. lix. 15—17 (comp. lxiii. 5).

² Is. lix. 16 *κατενόησε*, Targ. "notum est coram eo"; Rashi, "conticuit"; see his context, and Ibn Ezra (who dissents from Menahem's connecting the passage with Numb. xxiv. 3 מִתְנֶה). In Is. lxiii. 5, LXX *προσενόησα*, Aq. has *ἐξηπορήθην*.

³ Jn v. 44 *πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι*;

⁴ Jn xii. 39.

⁵ Jn ii. 25.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

This is true, and yet it is not the whole truth. Jesus is regarded in the Fourth Gospel as knowing at a very early date the future treachery of Judas. And yet, when it is close at hand, He is "troubled in spirit"; and, just before that, as though brought face to face with the divine decree, not in collision, but in silent resignation, He says "I know whom I have chosen, but—that the scripture may be fulfilled....¹" The Saviour is not "astonished," but He is brought to a position where He recognises that He can do nothing as a Saviour for a soul that He desires to save, and this "troubles" Him.

It is reasonable to conclude that John, though not intervening in any definite way in favour of Mark, might be said to intervene against a superficial interpretation of all the Synoptists, in order to point out that Jesus never "marvelled" and never encouraged others to "marvel," in the sense of mere amazement and astonishment. That conclusion is reasonable because those for whom John wrote, even if they did not discuss the superficial difference between Mark and the two later Synoptists, would be likely to talk about the "admiration," "wonder," or "marvel," ascribed to the Messiah by all the Synoptists alike in defiance of philosophic doctrine.

Beyond that, we cannot speak with the same confidence. But we may also, though with less confidence, regard it as probable that John went further in his allusive thought, somewhat to this effect: "I find Mark saying that the Messiah '*marvelled*' because of the '*unbelief*' of His neighbours at Nazareth, while Matthew and Luke say that He '*marvelled*' because of the '*belief*' of a centurion. Both sayings are correct in a certain sense. But in the Greek world they are likely to be misinterpreted. Of the two sayings, Mark's comes nearer to the general truth. Jesus said to a nobleman, 'Except ye, the dwellers at Capernaum, see signs and wonders, *ye will assuredly*

¹ Jn xiii. 21, 18 (comp. xvii. 12).

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

*not believe*¹—increasing the man's own belief, but certainly not praising it, and rather suggesting a general dispraise. Before this, He said to Nicodemus 'If I told you [and your friends] earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you heavenly things²?'. Also He said to the Jews 'How is it possible for you to believe—you who receive glory one from another?'

"These things I shall make clear in my Gospel, shewing how belief in God and in His glory was not possible in those who did not place the love of God and of God's glory above the love of themselves and their own glory, the glory that comes from this world; so that even the Lord's brethren said to Him 'If thou doest these things shew thyself unto the world.' For neither did His brethren believe on Him³.

"It was a custom of Jesus, when He was brought face to face with a seeming triumph of the powers of darkness, a triumph for a time, darkness before dawn, to say '*But*—in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled.' Thus He left the disciples to ask '*But what?*' He Himself gave no answer to the question, but broke off from speech into silence. This He did at the moment when He was arrested. After saying to the Jews 'I was with you day by day in the Temple and ye did not seize me' He is recorded^{*} by the Evangelists to have spoken thus:—

Mk xiv. 49	Mt. xxvi. 56	Lk. xxii. 53
' <i>but still, in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled.</i> '	' <i>but all this is come to pass in order that the Scriptures of the Prophets might be fulfilled.</i> '	' <i>but still this is your hour and the power of darkness.</i> '

"Matthew and Luke have paraphrased the Saviour's words so

¹ Jn iv. 48.

² Jn iii. 12.

³ Jn vii. 4—5.

JESUS IN HIS OWN COUNTRY

as to explain them. Mark alone has retained the Saviour's actual utterance and silence. I also shall retain it, as shewing how the Lord sometimes kept silence not through blank astonishment but as recognising the unsearchable wisdom of the power by which things evil are permitted to come to pass in order that good may follow¹."

¹ See *Joh. Gr.* 2105—11 quoting Mk xiv. 49 ἀλλ' ἵνα, Mt. xxvi. 56 δέ, Lk. xxii. 53 ἀλλά.

CHAPTER VI

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES¹

[Mark vi. 6b—13]

§ I. *Johannine "sending of the apostles"*

BEFORE discussing the expressions peculiar to Mark in the Synoptic accounts of the sending of the Apostles by Jesus, it

¹ Mk vi. 6b—13
(R.V.)

(6b) ... And he went round about the villages teaching.

(7) And he called unto him the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two; and he gave them authority over the unclean spirits;

(8) And he charged them that they should take nothing for [their] journey, save a staff only; no bread, no wallet, no money (*lit.* brass) in their purse (*lit.* girdle);

(9) But [to go] shod with sandals: and, [said he], put not on two coats.

(10) And he said unto them, Whosoever ye enter into a house, there abide till ye depart thence.

(11) And whatsoever place shall not receive you, and they

Mt. ix. 35, x. 1,
5—15 (R.V.)

(35) And Jesus went about all the cities and the villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness.

(1) And he called unto him his twelve disciples, and gave them authority over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of disease and all manner of sickness.

(5) These twelve Jesus sent forth, and charged them, saying, Go not into [any] way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans:

(6) But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

Lk. xiii. 22, ix. 1—6,
x. 4 (R.V.)

(22) And he went on his way through cities and villages, teaching, and journeying on unto Jerusalem.....

(1) And he called the twelve together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases.

(2) And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick (*some anc. auth. omit the sick*).

(3) And he said unto them, Take nothing for your journey, neither staff, nor wallet, nor bread, nor money; neither have two coats.

(x. 4) Carry no purse, no wallet, no shoes: and salute no man on the way.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

will be convenient to note the very few and brief Johannine mentions of such "sending"—that is to say, sending of disciples

Mk vi. 6b—13
(R.V.) *contd.*

hear you not, as ye go forth thence, shake off the dust that is under your feet for a testimony unto them.

(12) And they went out, and preached that [men] should repent.

(13) And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.

Mt. ix. 35, x. 1,
5—15 (R.V.) *contd.*

(7) And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand.

(8) Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils: freely ye received, freely give.

(9) Get you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses (*lit.* girdles);

(10) No wallet for [your] journey, neither two coats, nor shoes, nor staff: for the labourer is worthy of his food.

(11) And into whatsoever city or village ye shall enter, search out who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go forth.

(12) And as ye enter into the house, salute it.

(13) And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you.

(14) And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, as ye go forth out of that house or that city, shake off the dust of your feet.

(15) Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city.

Lk. xiii. 22, ix. 1—6,
x. 4 (R.V.) *contd.*

(ix. 4) And into whatsoever house ye enter, there abide, and thence depart.

(5) And as many as receive you not, when ye depart from that city, shake off the dust from your feet for a testimony against them.

(6) And they departed, and went throughout the villages, preaching the gospel, and healing everywhere.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

or apostles, described as a past act, not as future. Almost the only one that comes under this category is in an utterance of Jesus (following shortly after the last words of John the Baptist) "*I sent you* to reap that whereon ye have not laboured. Others have laboured and ye are entered into their labour¹." The next—also an utterance of Jesus—saying that an apostle "is not greater than he that sent him," cannot be said (at most) to do more than imply past sending². The third ("I have sent them into the world") seems to hover between past and future, as if it meant "I made them messengers, bearers of a message that is destined to go forth to the world³." The last instance is in the present tense ("I send"), contemplating future result, and the verb for "sending" is varied: "As the Father hath sent me, even so *send I you* [*severally on your several errands*]⁴."

Returning to the first of these instances, we perceive that, if it refers to any past and literal sending, the reference is probably to the previously mentioned "baptizing" practised by Christ's disciples after they and their Master had passed into "the Judæan land," that is, the districts of Judæa round about Jerusalem⁵. Concerning this, it is said that "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples [did]," and their converts are described as "more" than those baptized by John the Baptist⁶. The context informs us that "John was not yet

¹ Jn iv. 38. The last words of John the Baptist are (iii. 30) "He must increase, but I must decrease" (see *Joh. Gr.* Pref. p. viii).

² Jn xiii. 16 "A servant is not greater than his lord, nor *an apostle* (ἀπόστολος) greater than *he that sent him* (τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν)." R.V. txt "*one that is sent*," though it makes smooth reading, conceals two facts:—(1) that John here, and only here, uses the word ἀπόστολος, (2) that he uses two different words to express "sending." But R.V. marg. says "Gr. *an apostle*."

³ Jn xvii. 18 "As thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them into the world." See *Joh. Voc.* 1723 g.

⁴ Jn xx. 21 ἀπέσταλκέν με...πέμπω ὑμᾶς. See *Joh. Voc.* 1723 f—g.

⁵ Jn iii. 22 εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γῆν, see *Joh. Gr.* 2670 b.

⁶ Jn iii. 22 foll., iv. 1—2.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

cast into prison," but we are led to infer from the tone of the Baptist's last words that his imprisonment and death followed shortly afterwards¹. If the first Johannine Mission of the Twelve referred to this circuit in "the Judæan land," it would seem to have been brief, unimportant, and limited in scope². It appears to have hardly taken the disciples away from their Master's side, so that—in referring to the converts made as the result of their mission—the Evangelist hesitates between saying "Jesus baptized" and "the disciples baptized."

In this first mention of "sending," Jesus apparently desires to caution the disciples against self-conceit. "*Others* have laboured," He says. Who are those "*others*"? Later on, when Jesus says "Nor is an apostle greater than he that sent him," there is no such perplexing plurality, but here the question arises whether "*others*" meant merely the Law and the Prophets, so that the meaning is, in effect, this, "Do not suppose you are inventing, or are following me as inventing, a new religion."

The meaning is probably more than this. "The Law and the Prophets" included John the Baptist, the greatest of all the prophets. And the time was a crisis for John the Baptist and for Jesus. The Jews were making comparisons between them and endeavouring to sow jealousies between their several disciples, the group that still adhered to John, and the larger group that was gathering round Jesus. Andrew had been a disciple of the Baptist before he became a disciple of Jesus, and so had a companion of Andrew, unnamed³. When Jesus said

¹ Jn iii. 24—30.

² It is possible that some misunderstood tradition about this early mission to the villages, or village-cities, round Jerusalem may have originated the Tradition peculiar to Matthew x. 5—6 "Depart not into the way of the Gentiles...but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." A very early evangelist, explaining "the Judæan land," might say "This meant merely the Jews [not including Peraea, Samaria, or Galilee]." A later one might say "This meant that they were *not* to go to Samaritans or Gentiles."

³ Jn i. 40.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

"Others have laboured," Andrew and his companion could hardly fail to remember that, if they had been lately baptizing and making converts more numerous than those of John the Baptist, it was to the Baptist that their success was partly due. Moses and Isaiah had "laboured," but so had John. John was soon to pass out of men's view, to prison, and then to death—perhaps was already in prison. The disciples of Christ were to take up the work, the Baptist's work and Christ's work, gathering in the harvest. Let them prepare themselves to discharge their task by reverence for the Lord of the Harvest, and for the unity that bound His workers to one another and to Himself, and for the continuity of their work, which was, in truth, His work. Such seems to be the meaning of the Johannine "I sent you" and its context.

§ 2. *Jesus "going round the villages in a circle," in Mark¹*

The Diatessaron does not quote from Mark at this point, but from Matthew. Its quotation from Mark, with the addition

¹ Mk vi. 6 (R.V.)
...And he went round about the villages (*lit.* went about (*περιήγεν*) the villages in a circle) teaching.

Mt. ix. 35 (R.V.)
And Jesus went about (*περιήγεν*) all the cities and the villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness.

Lk. xiii. 22 (R.V.)
And he went on his way through cities and villages, teaching, and journeying on unto Jerusalem.

Matthew repeats the very rare intransitive *περιήγεν* in a similar tradition placed much earlier, as follows:—

Mk i. 39 (R.V.)
And he went into their synagogues throughout all Galilee, preaching and casting out devils.

Mt. iv. 23 (R.V.)
And Jesus went about (*περιήγεν*) in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people.

Lk. iv. 44
And he was preaching in the synagogues of Judaea (so W.H., and R.V. marg.).

Here *Diatess.* omits the first half of Mt. iv. 23, but quotes, in its

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

of "Nazareth" and "in their synagogues" ("And he went about in the villages *that [were] around Nazareth*, and taught in their synagogues"), does not occur till later on¹, just before the story of the execution of John the Baptist. The parallel Matthew, "And Jesus *went about all the cities and the villages*, teaching in their synagogues," is placed by the Diatessaron in two positions, not only here², before the Sending of the Apostles, but also much earlier³, when Jesus came out of Simon's house in Capernaum saying "Let us go into *the next village-cities*." These, as has been shewn elsewhere⁴, might mean *the villages round Jerusalem*. This somewhat favours the arrangement adopted in Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*, which places, as parallel to the Mark-Matthew tradition, the Lucan words "And he went on his way through cities and villages, teaching, and *journeying on to Jerusalem*."⁵ The centre of the Marcan "circle" appears to be quite uncertain⁶. The Lucan tradition may have been one of several attempts to explain "the villages in a circle."

place, words from Mt. ix. 35 (*Diatess.* vii. 7) "And Jesus was going about all the cities and the villages, and teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all the diseases and all the sicknesses, and (Mk i. 39 b) casting out the devils." It also quotes Mt. ix. 35 before the Sending of the Apostles, in *Diatess.* xii. 40. Its version of Mk vi. 6 b "And he went about in the villages that [were] around Nazareth..." it places much later (in *Diatess.* xvii. 53).

Lk. iv. 44 is read by *Diatess.* as "in the synagogues of Galilee" and placed very early (*Diatess.* vi. 35), after the healing of the nobleman's son (Jn iv. 46—54), and before Mt. iv. 13. On Lk. iv. 44 "the synagogues of Judaea," read by W.H. without alternative, see *Beginning* p. 209 foll., *Proclam.* pp. 233, 241 foll.

¹ *Diatess.* xvii. 53. ² *Diatess.* xii. 40. ³ *Diatess.* vii. 7.

⁴ See *Proclam.* p. 241 on (Mk i. 38) *καμποδοίς*.

⁵ Lk. xiii. 22.

⁶ The interpretation of the Diatessaron (which transfers Mark's tradition to a later period) "Nazareth," although following naturally from Mark's context, is antecedently improbable since Nazareth had given to Jesus but a poor reception.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

Matthew at this point—between the mention of “the cities and villages” and the Sending of the Twelve—inserts a saying of Jesus about “the harvest” and the need of “labourers¹.” Luke also has this. And we have seen above that John has a saying about the harvest in his first use of the word “sending,” as applied to the Apostles by Jesus (“I have sent you”). If, therefore, Matthew, Luke, and John agreed in prefixing this saying to an early Mission of the Twelve, about the time of the death of John the Baptist, we might feel some confidence that they all referred to the Mission described by Mark. But Luke has the following preface to his harvest-tradition: “*Now after these things the Lord appointed seventy [two] others, and sent them, two and two, before his face into every city and place whither he himself was about to come. And he said unto them, The harvest is plenteous....*”²

This, if taken with the Lucan context, makes it clear that Luke deviated from Matthew in his account of the Sending of the Apostles. Precepts that Matthew regarded as addressed to the Twelve, Luke regarded as additions erroneously made by Matthew to the brief tradition of Mark. They were really (in Luke’s opinion) addressed to the Seventy [Two] who were sent later on³. In all these varying traditions, there is nothing to disprove the supposition that John accepted the Marcan Sending of the Twelve and referred to it in the words “I sent you to reap.” Nor is there anything, so far, that calls for Johannine intervention.

¹ Mt. ix. 37—8. It prefixes a saying that Jesus (*ib.* 36) had compassion on the multitudes, because they were “as sheep not having a shepherd.”

² Lk. x. 1—2.

³ See *Clue 233—6, From Letter 922, 1015.*

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

§ 3. "He began¹ to send them out by two and two," in Mark

Why does Matthew reject the Marcan "by two and two"? And why does Luke reject it in his Sending of the Twelve but retain it in his Sending of the Seventy?

Matthew may have omitted it because it might be felt by some to be out of harmony with his epithet of "first²," which he alone attaches to Peter in his account of the appointment of the Apostles, inserted by him here. Also, as he alone mentions "Israel" in the context³, he may have thought that the symmetry between the Twelve Tribes of Israel and the Twelve Apostles, one for each tribe, was disturbed by the insertion of "by two and two."

Luke may have rejected it for similar reasons, so far as concerned the Sending of the Twelve, but may have recognised that it was a historical fact referring to *some* Mission of Apostles, and that it ought to be inserted in connection with that Mission. He accordingly inserted it in a Mission of Seventy (or Seventy Two) Apostles, which he described vaguely as occurring "after these things⁴." This Lucan insertion favours the view that "two," in Mark, is part of the original tradition. And, in itself, "two" is antecedently probable. In certain circumstances, there are obvious advantages in sending Missionaries in pairs.

¹ Mk vi. 7 "began." See *Corrections* 535 a on ἀρχομαι, which, in the course of some five and twenty instances in Mk, is never retained by Mt.-Lk., jointly, except in the parallels to Mk xiv. 19. It is used by John only once. We can hardly expect Johannine intervention on a grammatical point of this kind. But see *Joh. Voc.* 1874 a on the unique instance of ἀρχομαι in Jn xiii. 5 "He began to wash," interpreted by Origen as meaning that Jesus "began" the purification then, and completed it afterwards. "Αρχομαι in Mark, here, may have been interpreted by some as implying "the first of several acts of sending."

² Mt. x. 2 πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος.

³ Mt. x. 6, 23.

⁴ Lk. x. 1.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

But a question arises as to the nature of those "circumstances." What view would Luke and John, severally, be likely to take of them?

Luke's view is that the Apostles were to be "*witnesses*" of Christ's resurrection. With an expression of this view, we may almost say, his Gospel terminates, and the Acts begins¹: Hence "two" becomes at once probable. For the Law said "In the mouth of *two witnesses*, or *three*, shall every word be established," and this saying is quoted both in Matthew and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians², as being familiar to those who heard it.

John never uses the masculine noun, "*witness*," *martus*, so frequently employed by Luke in the Acts. Even when he ought to have used it in the words of Jesus quoting from the Law about witnesses, he avoids it, thus: "Yea, even in your law it is written that the *witness* (*marturia*) of *two human beings* is true," and continues, "I am he that *witnesseth* concerning myself, and the Father that sent me *witnesseth* concerning me³." One reason perhaps why John never uses the masculine noun *martus*, "*witness*," is that it is technically applied in the sense of "martyr" to Stephen and others⁴. But another probably is, that he desires to take this "*witnessing*" out of the region of legal technicalities of the nature of an *affidavit*, and to raise it into the region of a spiritual "*witnessing*," in which there is a harmony or correspondence between the members of a human family and the members of the divine Family—divine and yet, in some sense, "*human-beings*"—the

¹ Lk. xxiv. 48 "Ye are *witnesses of these things*," Acts i. 8 "*witnesses of me*," *ib.* 22 "*a witness of his resurrection*," comp. *ib.* ii. 32 etc.

² Mt. xviii. 16, 2 Cor. xiii. 1 quoting Deut. xix. 15.

³ Jn viii. 17—18 δύο ἀνθρώπων ἡ μαρτυρία ἀληθὴς ἐστίν. ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμῆς καὶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὁ πῆψας με πατήρ.

⁴ Acts xxii. 20 "thy *martyr* (*μάρτυρος*) Stephen," Rev. ii. 13 "my *martyr*, Antipas." See *Joh. Voc.* 1696 *e*, and comp. Rev. xi. 3, xvii. 6. It is also applied to Jesus in Rev. i. 5, iii. 14.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

Father and the Son, answering one another and testifying about the Spirit of Sonship. The "human being" is not to merge himself in the *martus*, or "martyr."

Some thought of this kind may be implied in traditions recorded by Matthew about the "two or three" gathered together in the name of Christ, and about the "agreement" of even "two" in prayer¹. R. Jochanan interpreted the sayings "Two are better than one," and "A threefold cord is not quickly broken²," as referring to father, mother, and child; and the Fourth Gospel is pervaded, in spite of the lofty nature of its mysticism, with the belief that the nature of God in heaven is best revealed to men through the nature of the family on earth.

As if to compensate for never using the masculine *martus*, John freely uses the verb *marturein*, "bear witness," and *marturia*, "witness [borne]," both in his Gospel and in his Epistle. But the subject of the *marturia* is not Christ's resurrection alone, or even prominently. It is Christ Himself, and His saving influence or personality³. John the Baptist, no doubt, is said to have "witnessed" concerning the descent of the Holy Spirit on Jesus⁴. But he can hardly be supposed to have seen this with the mere corporal eye. And the same statement may apply to the Evangelist's vision of the water and the blood described in the Gospel and referred to in the Epistle⁵.

Theophylact, illustrating the Marcan "by two and two," quotes from Ecclesiastes the saying "Two are better than one," and Jerome, commenting on the latter, says "It is better to have Christ abiding in oneself than to be alone and open to the assaults of the Adversary⁶." A similar thought is expressed in the Fourth Gospel where Jesus not only says about Himself

¹ Mt. xviii. 19—20.

² Eccles. iv. 9, 12.

³ Jn xv. 27, 1 Jn i. 1—2.

⁴ Jn i. 32—4.

⁵ Jn xix. 35 (comp. 1 Jn v. 6—7), see *Joh. Gr.* 2383—4.

⁶ See Prof. Swete on Mk vi. 7, and Jerome on Eccles. iv. 9.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

that He is never alone because the Father is with Him, but also declares that the true believer shall never be alone but shall have the helpful presence of Two in his heart: "If a man love me he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him¹." Victor of Antioch (on Mark) declares that Matthew, as well as Mark, divides (though "not clearly") the Apostles into pairs. Luke, as we have seen, divides the Seventy thus, but not the Twelve. It seems impossible that these textual differences should not attract the attention of Christians before the end of the first century, leading them to ask questions about the nature of apostolic testimony, and whether—and if so, why, and for how long a time—it was necessary that the Apostles should testify in pairs. When we realise this we shall feel that it is not so wildly fanciful as it may have appeared at first sight, to suppose that John desired to suggest a spiritual and permanent rule in place of one that was becoming mechanical. The invariable need was that every Apostle, even when alone, should be able to say, "And yet I am not alone²," and that he should feel himself to be bearing witness on earth in the Spirit of the Two Witnesses in heaven, namely, the Father and the Son³.

§ 4. "Save a staff only," in Mark⁴

The parallel Matthew and Luke say that the Apostles are *not* to take "a staff" while Mark says that it is the one thing

¹ Jn xiv. 23, xvi. 32.

² Jn xvi. 32.

³ Comp. 1 Pet. v. 1. On the allusions to twofold witness in Philo and Jewish literature, see *Joh. Gr.* 2588—90, and on 1 Jn v. 8 "Three are they that bear witness," see *Joh. Gr.* 2306. There is an allusion to the Jewish doctrine about two witnesses in Heb. vi. 18 "two immutable things," namely, God's "promise," and God's "oath."

It is interesting to note the only Johannine mention of twofold apostolic action in bringing people to Christ. It is little more than passive. Philip and Andrew are (Jn xii. 21—2) the agents by whom "certain Greeks" are introduced. But the Greeks take the initiative, "Sir, we would see Jesus."

⁴ Mk vi. 8, Mt. x. 9—10, Lk. ix. 3.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

that they *may* take (or perhaps *must* take). Also, Mark and Luke include "*bread*" in the things that are not to be taken. But Matthew omits "*bread*¹," perhaps following some tradition that identified it with "*staff*." For a sufficiency of bread might be metaphorically called in Hebrew "*the staff of bread*." And this might account for some of the Synoptic variations². It has been shewn that the original precept might have bidden the disciples take "*nothing except (IMH) the staff of bread*"—meaning, in a spiritual sense, the "*daily bread*" that comes from the Father—altered by Greek corruption into "*nothing, not (MH) staff, bread,*" and then into "*nothing, not staff, not bread*³."

To internal evidence must be added external. The words of Jacob "*With my staff* I passed over this Jordan⁴," though (apparently) not much noticed in the Talmuds, are allegorized by Philo and the Midrash. Rashi paraphrases them thus: "*I had with me neither silver, nor gold, nor cattle, but only my staff*." Rashi adds "There is also an allegorical exposition; Jacob had cast his staff into the Jordan and the Jordan was parted asunder." Philo takes "*staff*" as meaning God's *paideia*, i.e. schooling, training, or chastening⁵. This recalls the words of the Psalmist "Thou art with me; thy *rod* and thy *staff*, they comfort me; thou preparest a table before me..." There the Targum has "Thy Word is for my *support* (or, *sustenance*), thy upright rod and thy law shall comfort me"; and the context, as well as the special word "*support* (or,

¹ "Bread" is mentioned in *Didach.* xi. 6 "Let the missionary receive *nothing except bread* [to suffice him] until he reach his lodging for the [next] night," but in such a way as to shew that the writer may have accepted "*nothing save a staff only*" as meaning "*nothing save the staff, or sustenance, of bread* [for the day]."

² See *Clue* 263—7, which refers to "*staff of bread*" in Lev. xxvi. 26, Ps. cv. 16 etc., and to Nehem. v. 14 "*the bread of*" לחם, perhaps confused by LXX with "belonging to them," להם, αὐτῶν.

³ *Corrections* 390 (ii) (a).

⁴ Gen. xxxii. 10.

⁵ Philo i. 82—3.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

sustenance)," indicates that God is regarded, not only as guiding, but also as "sustaining" with food¹.

The Marcan tradition—after the words "save a staff only"—proceeds as follows, "no bread, no *wallet* (A.V. *scrip*)."
Matthew altogether omits "bread," and changes the order, but also has "no *wallet* (A.V. *scrip*)." Luke has "neither staff, nor *wallet* (A.V. *scrip*), nor bread." Thus all mention "*wallet*" (or "*scrip*"). Now the word for this in Delitzsch's Hebrew, and also in the Syriac of the Gospels, is applied to a shepherd's "*scrip*" both in Hebrew and Aramaic, and occurs in the Targum of the only passage where "*scrip*" occurs in our English Version of the Old Testament: "And he [David] took his *staff* in his hand, and chose him five smooth stones... and put them in the shepherd's bag... even (*lit.* and) in his *scrip*²." Jewish tradition said that David's coinage had on one side "*a staff and a shepherd's scrip*³." A proselyte says, "If an Israelite approaching the holy things shall die, how much more an insignificant stranger who comes with *his staff and his scrip*⁴!" Shammai, when he believed that Jonathan ben Uzziel had committed an error, is said to have "come to him (*or*, against him) *with his staff and with his scrip*"—which suggests a metaphorical meaning⁵. In view of these passages, and others

¹ Ps. xxiii. 4—5. See Levy *Ch.* ii. 177 on "*support*" as meaning "*food*." Jerome is in doubt whether "*staff*" means "*chastisement*" or "*sustenance and future consolation*." The Greek *πάβδος* represents (Hastings iv. 291) (1) the shepherd's rod or club, (2) the shepherd's staff, (3) the common staff. Aramaic (Brederek) does not preserve these distinctions.

² 1 S. xvii. 40.

³ *Gen.* i. on Gen. xii. 2 (Wü. p. 178).

⁴ See *Hor. Heb.* (on Mk vi. 8, Mt. x. 10) quoting *Sabb.* 31 a.

⁵ *Baba Bathra* 133 b. Goldschmidt renders it "*fiel mit Stab und Sack über ihn (עליו) her*," and explains it as "*strove with him (zankte mit ihm)*"—apparently taking it metaphorically. But *Hor. Heb.* (on Mk vi. 8) has "Shammai came to him with his staff and with his scrip," and adds "the Gloss saith, 'He came to contend with Jonathan, because he had violated the will of the dead.' Behold the vice-president of the Sanhedrin carrying a *scrip*,"

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

collected in *Horae Hebraicae*, two conclusions become certain, first, that every Jew would expect "staff" and "scrip" to go together; secondly, that if Jesus said "*staff, but not scrip*," some paradox was intended.

In the dialogue between Goliath and David, when Goliath, jeering at the shepherd's "staff," says "Am I a dog that thou comest unto me with *staves*?" David replies, "Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a javelin; but I come unto thee *in the name of the Lord of Hosts*¹." This suggests the thought that the shepherd's "staff" of David might be regarded as the emblem of the protecting presence of the Lord, like the staff of Jacob. And the question arises whether the Marcan tradition could be explained in the same way, as a combination of metaphorical with literal precept to the early preachers of the Gospel: "Take staff but not scrip, nor anything but the staff. As for your support, after the day's journey, throw yourselves on the hospitality and kindness of those to whom you bring the Good News. But not so for the journey itself. For that, be like Jacob, and take 'the staff.'"

§ 5. *A parallel from the Essenes*

Josephus says about the Essenes that when they journey they take nothing at all abroad with them "but go *in arms* (or, *in full armour*) on account of robbers²." This is absurd. It is also contradicted, in effect, by Philo's statement about the Essenes: "Darts, or javelins, or daggers, or helmet, or breast-plate, or shield—of all these you will find no craftsman among them, nor *maker-of-arms*, or *maker-of-machines*, or, to sum up,

in which he laid up victuals for his journey." Rodkinson translates it "came to rebuke him," omitting all mention of "*staff and scrip*."

¹ 1 S. xvii. 43, 45.

² Joseph. *Bell.* ii. 8. 4 ποιούνται τὰς ἀποδημίας, οὐδὲν μὲν ὅλως ἐπι-
κομιζόμενοι, διὰ δὲ τοὺς ληστὰς ἔνοπλοι. On ἔνοπλος, mostly meaning
"in full armour," or "fully armed," see Steph. *Thes.*

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

anyone practising things that have to do with war¹." An explanation of Josephus' error is suggested by Hippolytus, who, instead of the adjective *enhoploi*, "in-arms," uses *hoplon*, in the singular, which means "an implement [of any kind]." The Essenes, he says, "go about, carrying nothing but an implement²." In Greek, *enhoplon* may mean either "one implement," or "in-full-armour³." It is a reasonable conjecture that Josephus has mistaken "one implement" for "in full armour." But the reasonableness will be converted to something like certainty if we can shew what the "one implement" was.

Now both Josephus and Hippolytus describe in detail the Essenes as giving "a little hatchet," along with "white linen raiment," to those who join their sect⁴. Later on, this is identified with a "shovel⁵." This "shovel" is described as being used in fulfilment of the Deuteronomic precept to cover excrement that it may not pollute the camp in which the Lord

¹ Philo ii. 457 "maker-of-arms (ὀπλοποιόν)."

² Hippol. ix. 15 (T. and T. Clark, p. 353, but *ed.* Duncker ix. 20, p. 474) *περίασι δὲ τὴν πατρίαν γῆν ἐκάστοτε ἀποδημοῦντες μηδὲν φέροντες πλὴν ὅπλου*, Clark "nothing except arms," Duncker "nihil gestantes praeter arma." But Steph. *Thes.* gives no instance where the sing. ὅπλον means "arms." It means an implement of any kind. When meaning an instrument of war, it mostly means "shield" in LXX, e.g. Ps. xxxv. 2, lxxvi. 3, xci. 4 "his truth is a shield and a buckler," LXX ὅπλῳ κυκλώσει σε ἡ ἀλήθεια αὐτοῦ. In Hippolytus, the sense requires "They go about [as it were, perh. ins. ὡς] their native land whenever they travel abroad."

³ That is to say, ἐνοπλον may mean (1) *ἐν ὅπλῳ* or (2) *ἐνοπλον*. Hippolytus, adopting the former, might drop *ἐν* as being superfluous and unintelligible. The clause in Josephus, "on account of robbers," might naturally be added to explain why peaceful folk like the Essenes travelled (as he thought) "in-arms."

⁴ Joseph. *Bell.* ii. 8. 7 (simil. Hippol. *ed.* Duncker ix. 23) ἀξινάριον.

⁵ Joseph. *Bell.* ii. 8. 9 τῇ σκαλίδι τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἐστὶν τὸ διδόμενον ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀξινίδιον τοῖς νεοσυστάτοις (sim. Hippol. ix. 25 but with ἀξινάριον (Duncker)).

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

God "walketh¹." Our R.V. says "Thou shalt have a *paddle* among thy weapons" (where A.V. has "upon thy weapon"). But the margin gives "*shovel*." The Hebrew regularly means "[wooden] *nail*" or "*peg*." Also the literal Hebrew says that it is not "among" but "upon," or "above," the "implements" or "weapons" of the Israelites². The Jerusalem Targum has "A *nail* shall be fixed for you *upon the implements of your arms in the place where ye gird on your swords*."

The scriptural passage, and the varieties of rendering it, indicate that some may have regarded the "nail," or "peg," or "little hatchet," as an instrument of war, but others as one of peace, and may have severally adapted their descriptions to their views³. It is important to note that Zechariah uses

¹ Deut. xxiii. 13 "paddle (גלגל)," marg. "shovel." Gesen. 450 *a* gives only this instance of the meaning "spade." Elsewhere it mostly means "peg," or large pin, nail etc., and is rendered by LXX πάσσαλος, as here. Metaphorically, it is applied to any leader on whom Israel depends, e.g. Zech. x. 4 "From him shall come forth the *corner stone*, from him the *nail*," Targ. "King... *Messiah*," comp. Is. xxii. 23 and Ezr. ix. 8. The Patriarchs (Levy ii. 277) were called "*nails*." In LXX, Heb. "nail" = ἄνθρωπος (I), ἄρχων (I), πάσσαλος (II), στήριγμα (I), τάσσω (I).

² The word rendered "weapons" occurs only here (Gesen. 24 *b*). Walton has "super tuam zonam," as LXX ἐπὶ τῆς ζώνης σου, Onk. and Syr. "super arma tua."

³ Comp. the description of the weapons of the Roman infantry in Josephus (*Bell.* iii. 5. 5) ἡ δὲ λοιπὴ φάλαγξ [φέρει] ξυστόν τε καὶ θυρεὸν ἐπιμήκη, πρὸς οἷς πρίονα καὶ κόφινον ἄμην (v. γ. ἄμην) τε καὶ πέλεκυν, πρὸς δὲ ἱμάντα καὶ δρίπανον καὶ δλυσιν, ἡμερῶν τε τριῶν ἐφόδιον ὡς ὀλίγον ἀποδεῖν τῶν ἀχθοφορούντων ὀρίων τὸν πιζόν. Here the writer's object appears to be to shew that the Roman foot-soldier was so burdened that he "did not fall far short of a pack-mule" (Whiston, quaintly, "hath no great need of a mule to carry his burdens"). Now a recognised part of this burden was the "vallus," or stake for palisading the camp, to which Virgil alludes (*Georg.* iii. 347 "Romanus in armis injusto sub fasce") and which Horace mentions (*Epodes* ix. 13 "fert vallum et arma miles"). Why does Josephus, who gives so fully the details of the "injustus fascis" and the "arma," make no mention of the "vallus"? And what

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

"the Nail" absolutely (along with "the Corner Stone") where the Targum has "*the Messiah*" (along with "the King") to describe one on whom Israel hangs or depends; and this metaphor was carried into the Midrash, so that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are called "the three *nails* of the world¹." This favours the supposition that the Essenes attached to the term some emblematic significance. The language of Josephus also, in introducing the term, makes it difficult to believe that the Essenes regarded the implement merely as one for digging a small hole².

Philo describes the Deuteronomic "nail" as "meaning symbolically the *logos* that digs up the secrets of things done," and allegorizes the context at great length³. Neither there nor elsewhere does he give us a glimpse of Jewish tradition on the subject. Nor does he mention it in his short account of the Essenes. But in one passage referring to it he likens it to "a kind of defensive weapon," using the very word we are in need

precisely does he mean by ἀμν, which Hudson renders "*rutrum*," Whiston "*pick-axe*," L.S. (1) "*shovel*" or "*mattock*," (2) "*water-bucket*," (3) "*harrow*" or "*rake*"?

The passage is of importance because it shews that Josephus (or his secretary) is inadequate, if not inaccurate, in his description of the arms of the Roman legionary, with which he must have been well acquainted, and prepares us to believe that he was inaccurate in his mention of the "full armour" of the Essenes.

¹ Gen. i. on Gen. xiv. 20 (Wü. p. 200). See also *ib.* on Gen. xxv. 11 (Wü. p. 295) "*the nails of the earth*," in bad sense (Wü. "*die Mächtigen*").

² See Joseph. *Bell.* ii. 8. 6 "To those who seek their sect admission is not immediate; but [the candidate] remains outside for a year, and they prescribe to him the same way of life [as their own], giving him both a *little hatchet* (ἀξινάριον τε) and the above-mentioned girdle and white raiment." This is stated before we are informed of the use (or one of the uses) of the "*little hatchet*." And the passage suggests that the "*little hatchet*" (as well as the "*white raiment*") is regarded emblematically.

³ Philo i. 72.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

of (*hoplon*) to explain Josephus' mistake¹. In conclusion, we can say certainly that the Essenes did not travel about "in arms," and, almost as certainly, that the statement to that effect in Josephus is an error rising out of an erroneous interpretation of the "peg" in Deuteronomy. But it is not so easy to put aside his statement that the Essenes gave their neophytes something that might be so termed. And, if they did—whether it was merely used as an emblem or not—their practice might influence the language of Jesus in sending forth the messengers of His Gospel. Instead of "the Nail," Jesus might speak of "the Staff," with the Psalmist's thought in His mind, "Thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me," and with the desire to impress that thought on His disciples. Every traveller naturally had a "staff." But His travellers were to have one spiritually as well as literally. Thus Jesus might utter a mixture of the metaphorical with the literal which might be misunderstood and altered by Matthew and Luke, but retained by Mark, who often records what was certainly obscure and what he himself possibly did not fully understand: "Take no scrip, take no bread, but a staff must needs be taken."

§ 6. *What corresponds to "the staff" in John?*

It would be an error to say that there is an allusion to the Psalmist's comfort of the "rod" and the "staff" of God—and hence perhaps to the Marcan tradition about the "staff"—in the Johannine reiterated mention of the Comforter². For the Comforter does not mean the Sustainer or Supporter. It means "the Paraclete," "the friend called in to aid," the "alter ego" of Christ. Nevertheless, there is in the doctrine of the Paraclete an emphasizing of the truth of the Marcan

¹ Philo i. 118 "θεωρήξῃ," φησὶ γοῦν, "τῷ πασσάδῳ," is to be explained by the preceding (*ib.* 117) σὺν λόγῳ παραγενόμεθα, ὥσπερ ὅπλῳ τῷ ἀμυντηρίῳ. We are to "arm ourselves" with the Logos, or "nail," as being a defensive weapon like a breastplate.

² See *Joh. Voc.* 1720 *k*, *Joh. Gr.* 2793 foll.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

tradition "*save a staff only*" if we regard Mark as meaning that Christ's Missionaries are to depend on the *sustaining power of the Holy Spirit alone*, and not to trust to aids of their own, represented by the bread and the wallet and the silver and the gold that they may carry with them. Such a doctrine is expressed later on in Mark's and Luke's versions of the Discourse on the Last Days, when the disciples are told not to "premeditate" their pleadings before the rulers of this world, but to trust to the Holy Spirit to give them utterance¹. But in the Mission of the Apostles the doctrine is not expressed by Luke.

In John this doctrine is everywhere. It branches into so many metaphors that we are in danger of overlooking the one radical thought—that of "sustaining." The sustaining power raises, supports, and uplifts, from the moment of our spiritual birth. It is the water that regenerates from above; it is the wind, or spirit, or breath that regenerates within; it is the living water that quenches the thirst of the soul led astray by sin; it is the living bread; it is the life of the vine that gives life and fruit to the branches; it is the flesh and the blood of the Son bestowed on the disciples; it is the Father, by whom the Son lives; it is the Son, who is the resurrection and the life of men; and lastly, it is the Son's Friend, the Other Self, who is to pass into the hearts of the disciples in the Son's place, when the Son has ascended to the Father. Under cover of all these metaphors John says to us, in effect, "The Lord does not impose on you a number of definite practices or definite abstinences. He said to His Apostles that they need take nothing with them 'save a staff only.' He meant, and He still means when He says the same thing to us, 'Take nothing with you save me only. If you take my Spirit you will take me. And, taking me, you will take your staff.'"

¹ Mk xiii. 11, Lk. xxi. 14—15. It is not expressed there by Matthew (xxiv. 11—12) who inserts it in the Mission of the Twelve (x. 19—20).

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

§ 7. "Shod (R.V.) with sandals," in Mark¹

The word rendered "shod" is literally "fastened-below." When applied to persons, it means "*fastened-up* [as regards the shoe, or sandal]." In the case of a light shoe or slipper, a sloven, like Socrates, might go about *not* "fastened up²." But one who desired to be alert for action, as for example, a soldier, must be ready for the general's orders, as Epictetus says, "[with shoes] fastened, clothes on, armour on³." The Four Gospels all represent John the Baptist as using some metaphor about "*shoes*" in speaking of himself as God's messenger, and of Jesus, as his successor; and three of them mention the "loosing" of the "latchet," or "strap," with which the shoe was fastened⁴. It is in accordance with this metaphor that Mark here mentions, as a positive precept for the messengers of the Gospel, that they must go forth on their mission "with sandals fastened."

But why does Mark speak of "sandals" instead of "shoes"? Probably because he meant "*not shoes but sandals*." That is to say, the shoes were not to be heavy, such as (according to some interpreters) Matthew had in view when he wrote "whose shoes I am not able to carry⁵." They were to be light like the "sandals" of Mercury⁶. That is what the word would

¹ Mk vi. 9.

² Plato *Sympos.* 174 A "He met Socrates, fresh from the bath, (lit.) *fastened up as to his shoes* (τὰς βλαῖτας ὑποδεδεμένον)—a rare thing with him." Socrates explains that it is because he is going out to dinner. Hesychius explains σανδάλια as σάβδαλα, γυναικεία ὑποδήματα, ἃ καὶ βλαῖτια. Comp. *Gorg.* 490 E, where it is ironically suggested that a shoemaker must "walk about fastened-up in very large shoes laced up fully (μέγιστα δὲ ὑποδήματα καὶ πλείεστα ὑποδεδεμένον περιπατεῖν)."

³ Epict. i. 16. 4 ἔτοιμοι εἰσι τῷ στρατηγῷ ὑποδεδεμένοι, ἐνδεδυμένοι, ἐπλισμένοι.

⁴ See *Beginning* p. 79 foll.

⁵ Mt. iii. 11.

⁶ See Steph. *Thes.* quoting *Hom. H. Merc.* 79.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

suggest to Greeks. Probably there was an original allusion to Isaiah's saying (quoted by Paul) concerning the "beautiful feet" of the preachers of glad tidings who "published peace¹." The precept was metaphorical. The preachers of the Gospel were to be not only alert and unencumbered, but also joyful, as messengers inviting guests to a feast².

§ 8. *What corresponds to "sandals" in John?*

If we accept "sandals" in Mark as an emblem of messengers of peace and glad tidings, inviting the world to a feast of joy, we can hardly fail to be struck by the fact that toward the end of the Synoptic Gospels, and particularly in Christ's Discourse on the Last Days, there are very few indications of this aspect of the message. In that Discourse, Luke has "A hair of your heads shall assuredly not perish," and, later on, "But when these things are beginning to come to pass, look up and lift up your heads³"; but Mark and Matthew omit both these utterances. In Mark, the Greek "rejoice" is never used except in the "rejoicing" of the chief priests over the treachery of Judas, and in the ironical insult offered to Judas by the Roman soldiers, "*Rejoice* (i.e. *hail*), King of the Jews⁴"; nor does Jesus (in Mark) mention peace except in the phrase "Go in

¹ Is. lii. 7 quoted in Rom. x. 15. Comp. Targ. on Cant. vii. 1 "How beautiful are the feet of Israelites going up to appear before God thrice in the year with *sandals* of sealskin," where "*sandal*" is the Greek *σάνδαλον* transliterated. Sealskin is Talmudically connected (Levy *Ch.* ii. 176—7) with "joy." It represents Heb. (A.V.) "badgers' skin" used in the adornment of the Tabernacle (Gesen. 1065 a) and applied to "sandals" in Ezek. xvi. 10.

² See *Corrections* 390 (ii) (e) a. The meanings of the Hebraized word *sandalon* are various, and often different from Greek usage. Matthew and Luke might find difficulty in a word that generally meant, in Greek literature, a woman's shoe. But these considerations increase the probability that Mark represents the earliest tradition. In Goodspeed *σάνδαλον* does not occur.

³ Lk. xxi. 18, 28.

⁴ Mk xiv. 11, xv. 18.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

peace," and in the precept "Be-at-peace with one another¹." The other Synoptists are less silent, but none of them come up to the level of the joyfulness of Isaiah.

In explanation of Mark, it may be argued that "joy" and "peace" are assumed in the first sentence that he records as coming from Jesus, which ends with the words "Believe in the *gospel*²," i.e. in the good tidings of Isaiah. That is no doubt the case. And the acts of exorcism and healing and forgiving, and the bringing of the "little ones" into Christ's circle of disciples, are fulfilments of the good tidings. But this joyful aspect fades away as we proceed. If the conclusion of Mark's Gospel were extant it might have shewn the Saviour to us comforting His disciples with the assurance that joy and peace were henceforth theirs, and theirs to give to others. But as it is, there is no such assurance. And it is not very fully or directly expressed in Matthew's conclusion. Luke is the only Synoptist who ends his Gospel with a note of "great joy." And the "joy" is merely described by Luke, not uttered by Jesus.

In contrast with the Synoptic Discourse on the Last Days, the Johannine Final Discourse represents Jesus as saying to the disciples, first about peace, "*Peace* I leave (*or* bequeath) unto you, *the peace that is my own* I give unto you," and, later on, "These things have I spoken unto you that in me ye may have *peace*. In the world ye have tribulation. But be of good cheer, I have been victorious over the world³." Then, as to "joy," it is mentioned no less than six times in the Discourse, beginning with the saying "These things have I spoken unto you that *the joy that is my own* may abide in you and that your joy may be fulfilled⁴."

There can be little doubt that these gifts of "*peace*" and

¹ Mk v. 34, ix. 50.

² Mk i. 15.

³ Jn xiv. 27, xvi. 33.

⁴ Jn xv. 11 (*bis*), xvi. 20, 21, 22, 24. See also Jn iv. 36 "that he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together," and *ib.* xvi. 22 "your heart shall rejoice."

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

"joy," transmitted by Christ, who defines them as His "own," and testified to by all the Epistles, and by the history of the early Church, were historically much more important subjects in Christ's doctrine than would be inferred from the Synoptists alone. What Mark has left us to infer—from little more than the mere mention of the "sandals" that are to be worn by the messengers of the Good Tidings or Gospel—John has expressed and expanded in Christ's promises of that which was the essence of the Gospel—namely, the "peace" and the "joy" that He alone could bestow.

§ 9. "Scrip," "girdle," "purse"¹

We now come to clauses of special importance in their bearing on the question, "Were the precepts to the Twelve literal, or metaphorical, or both?" It is largely through Luke that we perceive this bearing. For Luke, who alone mentions "*purse*"—and that only in the Precepts to the Seventy, not in the Precepts to the Twelve—represents Jesus, later on, as saying to the Twelve "When I sent you without *purse* and scrip and shoes, lacked ye anything?... But now he that hath a *purse*, let him take it, and likewise a scrip. And he that hath not [one] let him sell his cloak and buy a sword²." Also, where Matthew has "Treasure up for yourselves treasures in

¹ These words occur as follows in the Sending of the Twelve and the Sending of the Seventy: "scrip," *πήρα*, in Mk, Mt., and Lk. (the Twelve), and also in Lk. x. 4 (the Seventy); "girdle," *ζώνη*, only in Mk vi. 8, Mt. x. 9; "purse," *βαλλάντιον*, only in Lk. x. 4 (the Seventy).

Πήρα occurs in 1 S. xvii. 40 (Sym.) "even in his *scrip*," *LXX συλλογήν*. R.V. has not altered "scrip" there, but in N.T. it has everywhere substituted "wallet" for "scrip." I have retained "scrip" so as to indicate the possibility of allusion in N.T. to O.T. Instead of "girdle" (the girdle being used as a purse) R.V. has *txt* "purse," marg. "Gr. girdle." I have retained "girdle," so as to distinguish Mk-Mt. *ζώνη*, "girdle," from Lk. *βαλλάντιον* "purse."

² Lk. xxii. 36 R.V. marg. "and he that hath no sword... and buy one."

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

heaven," Luke has, in a metaphorical sense, "Make unto yourselves *purses* that wax not old, a treasure in the heavens....¹"

These quotations, though they leave a great deal unexplained, demonstrate at all events the following facts about Luke. (1) He distinguishes between "*purse*" and "*scrip*." (2) He represents Jesus as speaking to the Twelve about a past prohibition to take "*purse*" and "*scrip*," whereas the past prohibition to the Twelve, as he himself records it, mentioned "*scrip*" alone². (3) He records a prohibition of "*purse*" and "*scrip*" as given to the Seventy. (4) He represents Jesus, on the eve of the Crucifixion, as speaking to the Twelve and cancelling the past prohibition of "*purse*" and "*scrip*."³ (5) He represents Jesus, at the same moment, as inculcating the "buying" of a "sword." (6) He represents Jesus, at an earlier period, as using "*purse*" in a metaphorical sense where the parallel Matthew ("treasure up treasures") does not mention it. These facts point to the almost certain inference that Luke was dissatisfied with the Mark-Matthew traditions about "*scrip*" and "*girdle*," and to the highly probable inference that he found difficulty in distinguishing between literal and metaphorical meanings in the Precepts to the Twelve and in the Precepts (that he supposed to be given) to the Seventy.

Before passing to the parallel Mark-Matthew, with its mention of "*girdle*," we should note the following Mishna which can hardly fail to have been in force during the first half of the first century: "Let no man enter into the mount of the Temple with his staff, nor with his shoes, nor with his *purse* (or, *pouch*, *pondtho*), nor with dust on his feet," where the Gemara has

¹ Mt. vi. 20, Lk. xii. 33.

² But Luke mentions money, *lit.* "silver" (ix. 3 μήτε ἀργύριον). Wetstein on Lk. x. 4 quotes a Scholiast explaining Aristoph. *Nub.* 157 ἔνι βαλαντίον ἀσ ἀνεν ἀργυρίου.

³ He does not record any cancelling of the prohibition of a "staff."

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

"neither with his staff in his hand, nor with his shoes on his feet, nor with money bound up with his linen, nor with a purse (*ponditho*) hanging on his back¹." Horae Hebraicae, besides these passages, quotes another in which, while the Mishna has *tharmil*, "*scrip*," the Gemara has *ponditho*, explained by the Horae as "an inner garment with pockets to hold money etc.," but also defined by an early authority as "a hollow girdle (or belt) in which they put up their money²." Here, then, we have "*scrip*," interchanged with "*purse*," and also with "*girdle [for money]*."

Now, returning to the Synoptic accounts of the Sending of the Twelve and the Sending of the Seventy, we find in them these same utensils of a pilgrim mentioned with similar variations. It does not seem likely that the coincidence is accidental. More probably Jesus alluded to ancient Jewish precepts—sometimes literally, but more often metaphorically—when He sent forth His disciples, or spoke of sending them. If so, and if we take Mark as the closest approximation to His precepts, He bade the disciples go forth as to the mount of the Temple, observing the precepts of the Temple in some respects, but not in all. They were *not* to lay aside their "staff," the staff of Jacob; they were *not* to discard "sandals," fit emblems of the "beautiful feet" of the messengers of the Gospel of Peace. But they were to discard the "*scrip*," inasmuch as they were to depend on the Father for their daily bread.

The next point is the "brass [money]" in the "girdle." An ancient Greek grammarian says that ignorant and common people used the word "brass" (equivalent to our "coppers"

¹ *Hor. Heb.* on Mt. x. 9 quoting *J. Berach.* ix. 5 and *Bab. Berach.* 62 b.

² *Hor. Heb.* ib. pp. 182—3. It also quotes two authorities defining the *tharmil* as hung round the neck (one adds "of the shepherd") and carrying victuals. *Comp. Levy* iv. 671 b quoting *Gen. r.* sect. 39 "How was David's coinage stamped? 'With a staff and a scrip (*tharmil*) on one side,'" and also *Kel.* xxiv. 11 "there are three kinds of *tharmil*." The connection between the *tharmil* and David favours the rendering "*scrip*."

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

or "copper") about money in general¹. Matthew and Luke, taking it thus, might naturally object to the term thus standing by itself. Matthew uses it, but not standing by itself. He has "no gold, [no,] nor yet silver, [no,] nor yet *brass*," so as to give the word emphatically its proper meaning of "coppers." Luke substitutes the ordinary Greek word "silver [money]," meaning "money" in general.

But it appears probable that "brass" was deliberately used in the earliest tradition to mean "cumbersome and vile coinage," with perhaps a suggestion also of liability to rust², and of the confining and restricting effect of a girdle full of brass money, hampering the limbs like a fetter. This view is supported by Biblical instances of the Hebrew "brass" being used for "fetters³." The word in this sense is plural. But it is exceptionally singular, and rendered "brass" by LXX, where Jeremiah says "He hath made *my brass* heavy⁴." The Hebrew "brass" is also used metaphorically to denote worthless people, who are as "dross⁵." Isaiah said about the Messiah that "righteousness" and "faithfulness" should be His "girdle." The "faithfulness" mentioned by Isaiah is, in fact, "truth," and is so rendered by LXX, and Revelation declared that it

¹ See *Corrections* 390 (ii) (β) quoting Pollux ix. 92.

² See *Corrections* 390 (ii) (γ)—(ε), and add Plutarch *Mor.* 665 A describing how lightning rusted brass coinage belonging to "a man asleep, girt with a money-belt containing coppers," ζώνην χαλκοῦς ἔχουσαν ὑπεζωσμένον. *Pesikt.* sect. 15 (Wü. p. 167) quoting Is. i. 22 "dross," speaks of brass money silvered over by forgers. In Mk xii. 41 (contrary to *Corrections*) "brass" may be meant literally, besides conveying a suggestion of contempt. "The multitude" gave as alms "brass," which they could very well spare, "the rich" gave "many things"—both classes "out of their superabundance"—but the poor widow's two mites surpassed all their gifts. The parall. Luke has (xxi. 1) "the rich, casting into the Treasury their gifts."

³ Gesen. 639 a.

⁴ Lam. iii. 7 "He hath made *my* (R.V.) *chain* heavy," LXX ἐβάρυνε χαλκὸν μου (Targ. "my fetters of brass on my feet").

⁵ Ezek. xxii. 18 "all of them are *brass*... they are the dross of silver."

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

was "a golden girdle¹." The Epistle to the Ephesians says to all Christians "Stand, having *girded* your loins with *truth*²." This "girdle" of truth, metaphorically represented by a "girdle" of "gold," would be the opposite of a "girdle" of falsehood, dross or "brass." Interpreted thus, Mark's peculiar tradition about "no brass in the girdle" falls into line with his peculiar tradition about being "shod with sandals." Both apply to the Apostles as messengers of the Gospel. The latter means that their message is to be one of joy and divine beauty; the former means that the messengers are to be alert, active, and unencumbered, with consciences free from any hampering sense of untruthfulness.

The Fourth Gospel does not intervene as to these negative precepts about "scrip," "purse," and "girdle." It gives us the impression that Jesus did not send His disciples away from Himself, or prepare them for being thus sent, till just before the Crucifixion. Then, and not till then, the Last Discourse represents Jesus in the Fourth Gospel as saying and reiterating to His disciples: "Do not suppose that I will desert you, when I am taken from you in the flesh, leaving you as unhelpt, unguided wanderers in the wilderness of this world. Ask what ye will, in my name, and I will give it you. 'Without me ye can do nothing,' but with me, and 'in my name,' ye can do all things. All shall be yours—scrip, purse, staff, sandals fit for the messengers of gladness, they shall all be given to you in the Peace and Joy that I will bestow. Even the sword, where need is of the sword, shall not be wanting to you in the power of that Spirit of mine, that other Self, which shall comfort those that need comfort, while it convicts those that need conviction. In the world ye shall have tribulation. But be of good cheer. I have been victorious over the world³."

¹ Is. xi. 5, Rev. i. 13.

² Eph. vi. 14.

³ See *Light 3829* on the "paradox" in N.T. contained in "the few mentions of 'victory,'" which are "mostly accompanied by mentions of what the world would call defeat."

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES /

§ 10. "Anointing with oil," in Mark¹ and James

In N.T.—apart from a quotation from the Psalms and from a negative sentence in Luke ("my head with oil thou didst not anoint")²—the only mention of "anointing with oil," besides this of Mark, runs as follows: "Is any among you suffering [hardship]³? Let him pray. Is any cheerful? Let him sing praise. Is any among you sick⁴? Let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, having anointed him with oil in the name [of the Lord]⁵. And the prayer of faith⁶ shall

¹ Mk vi. 13 *ἔλειπον ἐλαίῳ πολλοὺς ἀρρώστους καὶ ἰθεράπευον*. The text is ambiguous because, after *ἰθεράπευον*, we might supply "them," or "sick folk in general." SS has "were anointing with oil many, and were healing the infirm," indicating two classes. D, *ἀλείψαντες ἐλαίῳ πολλοὺς ἀρρώστους ἰθεράπευον*, makes it clear that there were *not* two classes. So does the v. r. *ἰθεραπεύοντο*, in some inferior MSS, and in Pseudo-Jerome ("sanabantur") whose comment (on Mk vi. 4—5) says "cum ungebant oleo aegros infirmitatem fidei [*i.e.* eorum] virtute corroborant," "they strengthen the infirmity of [their] faith by a mighty work." This suggests a moral as well as a physical strengthening.

² Heb. i. 9 *χρίω* (quoting Ps. xlv. 7) and Lk. vii. 46 *ἀλείψω*.

³ Jas. v. 13 *κακοπαθεῖ*. Comp. Jas. v. 10—11 *κακοπαθίας*, instanced by the prophets and Job. It would include, but not necessarily mean, persecution.

⁴ *ἄσθενεῖ*, "weak" in body, or in mind, or in soul, or in resources, according to context.

⁵ *Ἀλείψαντες*, not literally "anointing" but "having anointed." "With oil" distinguishes the anointing from one with perfumed ointments for luxury. "In the name of the Lord" distinguishes it from mere medical anointing.

Ἀλείψω, in LXX, represents three distinct Hebrew words, (1) *חָבַס* = "daub," "whitewash," (2) *חָנַס* = "anoint [for health or comfort]," (3) *חָשַׁב* = "anoint [priests, kings, and sometimes prophets]." Delitzsch uses *חָנַס* here.

Heb. *חָנַס* = (Tromm.) *ἀλείψω* (6), *χρίω* (2). Heb. *חָשַׁב* (holy anointing) = *ἀλείψω* (4), *χρίω* (62). Thus, as a rule, holy anointing is distinguished by LXX from sanitary anointing. The former, from which "Messiah" ("the Anointed") is derived, = *χρίω*, the latter = *ἀλείψω*.

⁶ "The prayer of faith" emphasizes the fact that the anointing is not merely medical.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

save¹ the failing [man]², and the Lord shall raise him up³, and if he have committed sins it shall be forgiven him⁴."

The difficulties of this passage are obvious. If "sick" and "save" and "raise up" refer to physical health, then the writer

¹ "Save," σώσει. Σώζω, in N.T., = A.V. "heal," R.V. txt "make whole," R.V. marg. "save," in Mk v. 23, Lk. viii. 36, Acts xiv. 9; A.V. and R.V. txt "make whole," R.V. marg. "save," in Mk v. 34, Lk. viii. 48, 50, Acts iv. 9 etc.

Διασώζω, in Mt. xiv. 36, = A.V. "make perfectly whole," R.V. "make whole"; in Lk. vii. 3, = A.V. "heal," R.V. "save."

² Τὸν κάμνοντα "the failing [one]," is often used for "the patient," *lit.* "him that is failing [in vital power]." The only other N.T. instance of κάμνω is Heb. xii. 3 *ἵνα μὴ κάμῃτε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ἐκλυόμενοι*. Comp. the only instance of κάμνω in canon. LXX, Job x. 1 *κάμνων τῇ ψυχῇ μου*, Heb. "My soul is weary," and *Hermas Mand.* viii. 10 *κάμνοντας τῇ ψυχῇ παρακαλεῖν, ἐσκανδαλισμένους... ἐπιστρέφειν... ἁμαρτάνοντας νοθεύειν*. These passages—and the frequent Biblical use of ἐκλύσθαι absolutely (*e.g.* Heb. xii. 5 quoting Prov. iii. 11) meaning "fall to pieces," "collapse"—indicate that in Heb. xii. 3 *ταῖς ψυχαῖς* goes with *κάμῃτε* (not with *ἐκλυόμενοι*). In Tatian § 16 *ὁ κάμνων θεραπεύεται* and § 18 (*δαίμονες*) *ἀποπτάμενοι τῶν καμνόντων, κάμνω* refers to those possessed with devils. The passages, as a whole, suggest that κάμνω in Jas. implies a spiritual breaking down, a failure in faith, as well as a failure in health. Comp. Ps. lxxvii. 2—10 where the Psalmist, failing in faith and apparently in health at the same time, exclaims "Hath God forgotten to be gracious?" and then adds "This is my *infirmity* (Aq. *ἀρρωστία*)" (see context in R.V. txt and marg.).

³ "Shall raise him up (*ἐγερῇ αὐτόν*)." This is ambiguous because *ἐγείρω*, when used transitively with a personal object, may mean (1) "raise [from a bed of sickness]" or (2) "raise [morally and spiritually]" (as in *Clem. Rom.* § 59 *τοὺς πεπτωκότας ἐγειρον... ἐξανástησον τοὺς ἀσθεοῦντας, παρακάλεσον τοὺς ολιγοψυχούντας*), or (3) "raise [from the dead]." But in N.T., though the third use is frequent when the word is applied to God "raising up" Jesus, *i.e.* from the dead, yet *ἐγείρω* without *νεκρούς* is not applied to God "raising up" men from the dead except in 2 Cor. iv. 14 "He that *raised up* the Lord Jesus *shall raise up* us also with Jesus"—where the antithesis explains the exceptional usage. The evidence of N.T. use favours the rendering (in James) "shall raise him up [from his sick bed]."

⁴ Jas. v. 13—15.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

seems to promise Christians immortality on earth, for no Christian need die if he has time to "call for the elders." If the words refer to spiritual health, then they appear to promise forgiveness to the perpetrator of the most detestable sins if he can induce "the elders" to "pray over him" with "the prayer of faith." Origen, in a passage that does not quote James, but only a phrase from the Johannine Epistle ("a sin unto death"), yet indicates a danger that might arise from the language of James, when he describes "*certain men who claim even more than the priestly power,*" and who profess to obtain forgiveness for everything, "*as though, through their prayer, even 'the sin unto death' was remitted*¹." Also Irenaeus speaks of heretics who professed to "redeem" the dying, anointing them and teaching them invocations whereby they might evade the powers of evil after death². Elsewhere Irenaeus testifies to the fact that, in his days, besides exorcism, and prophesying, some had the gift of healing (by the laying on of hands) "*the failing [ones]*"—where he uses the Jacobean word above noted³. He does not here mention "oil"; but Tertullian says that the emperor Severus kept in his palace, till the day of his own death, a Christian named Proculus, out of gratitude "*for having once cured him by oil*⁴."

¹ Origen *De Orat.* § 28 *ad fin.* ὡς διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς αὐτῶν... λυομένης καὶ τῆς πρὸς θάνατον ἁμαρτίας, an allusion to 1 Jn v. 16, which he proceeds to quote.

² Iren. ii. 21. 5 "Alii sunt qui *mortuos* redimunt ad finem defunctionis, mittentes eorum capitibus oleum et aquam... et cum supradictis invocationibus... et *praecipiunt eis*, venientibus ad potestates, haec dicere postquam mortui fuerint." The context proves Grabe to be right in saying that "*mortuos*" is an error (for "*morientes*") perhaps caused by a mistranslation of τελευτῶντας. Comp. Epiphanius (borrowing from Irenaeus) *Haer.* 36 (vol. ii. p. 263) τοὺς τελευτῶντας... καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἔξοδον φθάνοντας, and especially τῇ κεφαλῇ τοῦ ἐξεληθόντος, which ought to mean "of the departed," but which is rendered (as the sense seems to demand) "*morientis.*"

³ Iren. ii. 32. 4 τοὺς κάμνοντας... λύνται καὶ ὑγίαι ἀποκαθιστᾶσιν.

⁴ Tertull. *Ad Scap.* § 4 "qui eum per oleum aliquando curaverat."

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

These facts shew that in the second century there were much-discussed traditions about Christian anointing with oil, pointing back to a first-century practice, which has been left unmentioned by all the Gospels but Mark's, and by all the Epistles except that of James.

§ II. "*The sin unto death*"

Above, we have found Origen quoting the Johannine Epistle about "the sin unto death" in a warning against some who claimed for themselves, and for their prayers in behalf of the sinner, a more than priestly power¹. There, he did not quote from James. Elsewhere, commenting on Leviticus ("If the anointed priest shall sin"), he does quote from James. There, he lays main stress on the confession of the sinner, not on the prayer of the elders. He is describing the seventh and last of the paths to the remission of sins. It is through penitence, tears, and confession: "Herein is fulfilled that which James the Apostle says, If anyone is infirm (infirmatur) let him call the elders of the church, and let them place their hands on him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the infirm (infirmum) [om. '*and the Lord shall raise him up*'], and if he has been [entangled] in sins they shall be remitted to him²."

It is strange that so careful a quoter as Origen should here omit the words "*and the Lord shall raise him up*." If the Latin expresses what Origen wrote in Greek, it may be that he thought the "raising up" an ambiguous phrase (meaning either "raise up from the sick bed," or "raise up after a spiritual fall³," or

¹ See p. 177, quoting *De Orat.* § 28.

² Origen (on Lev. iv. 3 "if the anointed priest shall sin") *Lev. Hom.* ii. 4 (Lomm. ix. 193).

³ Comp. Clem. Rom. § 59 above quoted τοὺς πεπρωμένους ἔγειρον and see πίπτω meaning "fall [through want of faith]" etc. in Rom. xi. 11, 22, xiv. 4, 1 Cor. x. 12, xiii. 8 "love never *falleth*," i.e. never utterly fails or breaks down.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

"raise up at the last day") the insertion of which would obscure what he deemed to be certainly the drift of the whole passage, namely, the way open to forgiveness for the infirm soul entangled in sins.

In the same commentary, later on, speaking of the path to forgiveness through tears, Origen says "There are also those sins which are said to be '*unto death*¹.'" But he does not explain how far "the elders," in the Epistle, correspond to "the priest of the Lord" whom he describes as receiving the confession of sins under the Law, or why one "elder" would not (apparently) suffice². In his Johannine commentary he says that John, while mentioning "a sin unto death," at the same time "points out a distinction, namely, that a certain sin is the soul's death and a certain sin is its sickness³." But elsewhere—about an apparent proof from the Gospels and Epistles that some sins are to the soul's loss but not to its death—he quotes the Johannine distinction between sins unto death and sins not unto death, and adds "What kinds of sins are unto death, and what are not unto death, but unto loss, I do not think can be distinguished easily by any human being⁴."

¹ Origen *Lev. Hom.* xi. 2 (Lomm. ix. 380) "*Dicimus enim et ad Deum quoniam (Ps. lxxx. 5) 'Dedisti nobis panem lacrimarum...' Sunt ergo ista peccata quae dicuntur 'ad mortem'*" (I Jn v. 16).

² *Lev. Hom.* ii. 4 (Lomm. ix. 193) "Est adhuc et septima [*i.e.* via ad remissionem peccatorum]...cum lavat peccator in lacrimis stratum suum...et cum non erubescit sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum et quaerere medicinam, secundum eum qui ait (Ps. xxxii. 5) '*Dixi pronuntiabo adversum me injustitiam meam Domino, et tu remisisti impietatem cordis mei.*' In quo impletur... (Jas. v. 14)...vocet presbyteros ecclesiae..." Comp. *Luc. Hom.* xvii. (Lomm. v. 150) quoting Ps. xxxii. 5 and mentioning as a condition "Si revelaverimus peccata nostra non solum Deo sed et his (v.r. iis) qui possunt mederi vulneribus nostris." Rashi regards the "confession" in Ps. xxxii. 5 as made by David to Nathan (2 S. xii. 13).

³ Origen *Comm. Joann.* xix. 3 (Lomm. ii. 166).

⁴ *Exod. Hom.* x. 3 (Lomm. ix. 126) "Non puto facile a quoquam hominum posse discerni," after quoting 1 Cor. iii. 15, Mt. xvi. 26 and

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

This frank expression of inability to explain the Johannine distinction justifies the conclusion that, in very early days, when faith-healing was frequent in the Christian Churches, and when anointing the sick was frequently used in the hope of a miraculous healing, the Marcan tradition in the Precepts to the Twelve would be a subject of much discussion. We cannot go so far as to say that John alludes to it in his Epistle. But we can say that such an allusion is by no means improbable.

§ 12. "Anointing" among the Jews

Anointing among the Jews for the sick was practised as a medicinal remedy. But the book of Job and very many passages in other books of the Bible testify to the belief that sickness was regarded as a divine punishment for sin. And all would admit that sickness does often come as the effect of intemperance, sensuality and other vices. It would therefore be natural

1 Jn v. 16. He adds "*Scriptum namque est (Ps. xix. 12) Delicta quis intelligit?*" A connection between "sin unto death" under the Law and "sin unto death" under the Gospel is traceable—though the phrase is not used—in Heb. x. 28—31 "*A man that [is found to have] set at naught Moses' law (Deut. xvii. 2—6) dieth without compassion. . . . Of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be counted worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God. . . !*" i.e. more particularly, by apostatizing and publicly "blaspheming Christ." Comp. Acts xxvi. 11 "*I strove to compel them to blaspheme,*" and Pliny's letter to Trajan (§ 96) which says that he acquitted those who "*male dicerent Christo.*"

See Schöttgen (on 1 Jn v. 16) on the Talmudic distinction between a sin that makes the sinner liable to death, and one that makes him liable to excommunication. *Numb. r. Wü. p. 268* quotes 1 S. ii. 25 "*They [i.e. Eli's sons] hearkened not unto the voice of their father, because the Lord was minded to slay them,*" in a recognition of sins so persisted in that a "decree of death" goes forth. Jewish expressions of this kind, referring to literal as well as spiritual death, if retained by Jewish Christians in the first century, might explain several apparent instances of confusion between the literal and the spiritual. For the meaning perhaps attached by John to "the sin unto death," see below, p. 188.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

that among the Jews this anointing should be accompanied by prayer. Ben Sira, in a passage printed below, instructively indicates that the prayer might proceed from the physician as well as from the patient, and shews how naturally a promise of healing ("pray unto God for God will heal") might be made with confidence, because, even if the patient was not physically healed, his sins might be forgiven and he might receive spiritual healing¹.

A Jewish tradition about the celebrated Rabbi Meir shews how anointing of this kind, no doubt accompanied by prayer, might be practised by a patient's friends whose presence might correspond to that of "the elders" mentioned by James: "R. Simeon Ben Eliezer saith, R. Meir permitted the mingling of wine and oil, and to anoint the sick on the sabbath. But

¹ Ben Sira (*ed.* Schechter and Taylor) begins (xxxvii. 30—31) by warning his readers against "luxury" that brings "sickness," against "surfeit" that is followed by "loathing," and against "intemperance" that ends in "perishing." Then, after declaring that God appointed the physician for men, and brought medicines out of the earth, he proceeds as follows (xxxviii. 7—14) "By them doth the physician assuage pain; and likewise the apothecary maketh a confection: that his work may not fail; nor health from among the sons of men. My son, in sickness be not negligent: pray unto God, for He will heal. Flee from iniquity, and from respect of persons; and from all transgressions cleanse thy heart. Offer a sweet savour as a memorial; and fatness estimated according to thy substance. And to the physician also give a place; and he shall not remove, for there is need of him likewise. For there is a time when in his hand is good success: for he too will supplicate unto God, that He will prosper to him the treatment (*or*, draught), and the healing, for the sake of his living."

The LXX differs somewhat from the Hebrew, and concludes thus: "There is a time when also in *their hands* [*i.e. the hands of the physicians*] there is good success, for *they too* will supplicate the Lord that He may prosper to them [*the*] relief [*of the sufferer*] and healing for the sake of continuance in life." The plural appears to refer to physicians, but it might represent also the sufferer's friends administering the ointment prescribed by the physician.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

when he once was sick, *and we would do the same to him*, he permitted it not¹."

Quoting this, the author of *Horae Hebraicae* prefixes to it the remark, "The Jews say, and that truly, such an *anointing* was physical, although it did not always obtain its end. But this *anointing* of the apostles ever obtained its end." The first of these statements may be accepted. But the second is hazardous. When Ben Sira writes (as quoted above) "My son, in sickness be not negligent; pray unto God, *for He will heal*," we may say, "This means '*He will sometimes heal*' or '*He will give thee, if not bodily healing, something corresponding to it*.'" May we not also say the same thing about the anointing described by Mark and that described by James? It seems probable that, when the Jewish practice of medical anointing passed into the hands of Christian elders—who anointed in the name of Christ, and who often effected marvellous results of physical healing²—the old words "sickness," "healing," and "raising up" might be used sometimes physically, but sometimes spiritually, so that in the course of a few years, after faith-healing had become comparatively rare in the Christian

¹ See *Hor. Heb.* (on Mk vi. 13) quoting *J. Berach.* iii. 1. The story is repeated in *J. Sabb.* xiv. 3 (also in *B. Sabb.* 134 a).

² Of these, the most remarkable is Peter's raising Tabitha to life. But there is a difficulty in believing that Tabitha's friends could have sent for Peter almost as if reckoning upon his power to raise the dead (Acts ix. 37—8) "Now it came to pass in those days that she fell sick and died (*ἀσθενήσαντες ἀποθανεῖν*), and they washed her and placed her in an upper chamber. Now, as Lydda was nigh unto Joppa, the disciples, having heard that Peter was there, *sent* (*ἀπέστειλαν*) *two men to him with entreaty, Delay not to come on to us*." The difficulty will be diminished if we suppose that the aorist, *ἀπέστειλαν*, here means "[*previously*] *sent*," i.e. *when she fell sick or reached such a stage that death seemed imminent*. See *Joh. Gr.* 2460 quoting Jn v. 13 "Jesus [*previously*] *conveyed himself away*" (R.V. and A.V. "*had conveyed himself away*"). It is noteworthy that the Acts and the Epistles (except that of James) make no mention of "anointing with oil."

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

Church, the traditions about past faith-healing and those about past spiritual healing were often not easy to distinguish.

§ 13. "Anointing [with oil]" metaphorical

Eusebius quotes Philo as saying about the Essenes that they were "anointed for fellowship¹," and this, not using the word *chriein*, which denotes spiritual anointing, but using the word we have been all this time discussing, *aleiphein*, "anoint [for health, or comfort]²." The explanation is this. The Greeks used *aleiphein* to mean "anoint for gymnastic exercise." Hence they applied it literally to the Master of a gymnasium, training the young gymnasts for their exercises. But hence they also applied it metaphorically to any kind of training for action³. Philo here thus applies it metaphorically to Moses of whom he says "*Our Lawgiver anointed* myriads of his disciples *for fellowship*." Clement of Alexandria does the same thing, saying that the Logos "*anoints*," not meaning "holy anointing" or "consecration," but preparation for a wrestling against evil—such a wrestling as befell Jacob, the wrestler at Peniel, when the Logos trained and anointed him for his conflict⁴.

In the only passage where the Apostolic Fathers mention this "anointing (*aleiphein*)," it is connected with "teaching," where Ignatius writes "Be not *anointed* with the evil savour of the *teaching* of the ruler of this world," contrasting this with the "ointment" that "the Lord received on His head that He might breathe incorruptibility to the Church⁵." Its only instance in Epictetus is literal, but yet such as to shew how

¹ Euseb. *Praepar. Evang.* viii. 11 μυρίους δὲ τῶν γνωρίμων ὁ ἡμέτερος πομποῦντος ἡλείψεν ἐπὶ κοινωνίαν, οἱ καλοῦνται μὲν Ἑσσαιῶν... οἰκοῦσι δὲ πολλὰς μὲν πόλεις τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

² See above, p. 175, n. 5.

³ Steph. *Thes.* ἀλείφω.

⁴ Clem. Alex. 132 ὁ συγγυμναζόμενος καὶ ἀλείφων κατὰ τοῦ πονηροῦ τὸν ἀσκητὴν Ἰακώβ. The context calls the Logos ὁ ἀλείπτης... τῷ Ἰακώβ. See Mayor's Index (ἀλείφω).

⁵ Ign. *Eph.* § 17.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

a Christian writer might apply the word metaphorically to a catechist, or recently baptized Christian still "under training¹." Some traditions of this kind, applied to converts or catechists, may have been intelligible enough in Rome (or other Western Churches) to Christians familiar with vernacular Greek, but may not have seemed to Matthew and Luke adapted for Eastern Churches or for educated Greeks.

§ 14. "*Many that were infirm*," in Mark²

Returning to the word "infirm" in the Marcan passage under discussion, we note that it is never used by Luke. In Attic Greek it implies mostly "slackness"; it is hardly ever used in canonical LXX, and never by any of the early Fathers or Apologists³. Matthew uses it but once—where the parallel Mark describes Jesus not as healing but as "teaching," but Luke mentions both⁴. Origen explains the word in Matthew metaphorically; and, in the same context, he explains the only N.T. instance of the word outside the Gospels: "For this cause among you many are weak and *infirm*, and not a few are falling-asleep," that is to say (according to Origen) many are weak in faith, or, as it were, chronic invalids, and not a few are falling into a slumber that will make them dead to all faith⁵.

¹ Epict. i. 2. 26 ὡς ἀνὴρ, ἔφη, ἀνὴρ δ' Ὀλύμπια κεκηρυγμένος καὶ ἡγωνισμένος. . . οὐχὶ παρὰ τῷ Βάτωνι ἀλειφόμενος, i.e. a crowned veteran, whose name has been proclaimed in the Olympic games, "no longer *under training in the school of Bato*."

² Mk vi. 13.

³ See ἄρρωστος in Steph. *Thes.*, *Oxf. Conc.*, and Goodspeed. LXX has more frequently ἄρρωστίω and ἄρρωστία.

<p>⁴ Mk vi. 34 And he began to teach them many things.</p>	<p>Mt. xiv. 14 And he (lit.) tended (ἰθεράπευσεν) their infirm [ones].</p>	<p>Lk. ix. 11 And he spake to them of the kingdom of God and them that had need of (lit.) tend- ing (θεραπείας) he pro- ceeded to heal (ἰάρο).</p>
---	--	--

⁵ Origen on Mt. xiv. 14 quoting and fully explaining 1 Cor. xi. 30 πολλοὶ ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἄρρωστοὶ καὶ κοιμῶνται ἱκανοί. Apparently Origen regards the loss of spiritual strength and spiritual health, and the

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

By Mark himself the word is obviously taken in a literal sense when he says that Jesus, in His own "country," *was not able to do any "mighty work," except that He "laid his hands on a few infirm [folk] and healed them¹.*" The Mark-Appendix makes the unqualified promise "These signs shall follow them that believe: in my name. . . they shall lay hands on *the infirm* and they shall recover²." This, like the similar passage in the Epistle of James, must mean "they shall *sometimes* lay hands," or perhaps "they shall *sometimes* recover." Or "*sometimes*" must be inserted in both cases. No "oil" is mentioned in the Mark-Appendix.

The result of these traditions about the "infirm," as also of those about "anointing," and "raising them up," is to confirm the impression that the followers of Jesus did actually heal in a physical sense, but that the accounts of physical and those of spiritual healing were so expressed, and so mingled,

access of spiritual slumber, as being God's judgments on those who partake unworthily of the Lord's Supper. Origen explains *κοιμῶνται* by *νυστάζοντες τὴν προαίρεσιν* and *ὕπνῳσσαντες τοῖς λογισμοῖς*, and *ἐννύπνιζόμενοι* as if it referred to fleshly dreamers who, he says, (comp. 2 Pet. ii. 10) "blaspheme glories." But we must have regard to the fact that Paul is alluding to some who made a feast, or even a drunken feast, of the Lord's Supper. Isaiah—after frequent rebukes of those that (Is. v. 11, 22) "follow strong drink," and after predicting that (*ib.* xxiv. 9) "strong drink shall be bitter to them," and declaring that (*ib.* xxviii. 7) "the priest and the prophet have gone astray through strong drink," at last bids the drunkards go on their own wilful course and endure a "deep sleep" as the consequent judgment, a sleep caused not by wine but by retribution (*ib.* xxix. 9—10) "Take your pleasure and be blind. . . for the Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep. . . ." Comp. Jerem. li. 39 "I will make them *drunken* that they may rejoice, and *sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake.*" Such a "sleep" is a "judgment," but it is not a dreaming so much as a deadly torpor. Comp. Ps. xiii. 3 "Lighten my eyes lest I *sleep death.*"

¹ Mk vi. 5 "healed," *lit.* "tended," *ἰθεράπευσεν*, on which see *Proclam.* pp. 208—20.

² [Mk xvi. 17—18.]

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

that the enemies of Christians might sometimes shew good reason for impugning their veracity¹.

Another point to be noted is that Mark's statement of the manner in which the Twelve carried out the precepts of the Lord ("and they went forth and preached . . . and healed them"²) *makes no mention of their baptizing*. We should have expected "baptizing" to follow "preaching," thus: "And they went forth and preached that men should repent, *and they baptized many*." According to the Fourth Gospel, this was the one thing that the Twelve did, namely, "baptized" many—and so "many" that the Evangelist calls them "more disciples than John baptized." And that this was in the name of Jesus, that is to say, under the authority of Jesus, we learn from the fact that at first the Gospel says that Jesus baptized, though afterwards it adds "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples did³." It is difficult to believe that Mark's original omitted "baptizing." Perhaps, however, "baptizing"—expressed by "enlightening," or by "raising up from darkness," or by "anointing with the Spirit," or by "anointing in the NAME"—is latent in the Marcan "anointing."

This is compatible with the hypothesis that the tradition (which is omitted by Matthew) is antedated by Mark and belongs

¹ See Lightf. on Clem. Rom. § 59 (quoted in part above, p. 176) "Raise up the fallen . . . ; *heal the ungodly* . . . ; feed the hungry ; release our prisoners (*δεσμίους*) ; lift up the weak (*τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας*) ; comfort the faint-hearted." Here "prisoners" is (doubtless) literal, but "the ungodly" is, in Syr., "*aegrotos*." This might represent *ἀσθενείς*, i.e. "the sick." Against this, however, is the subsequent *ἀσθενοῦντας*, which would come superfluously after a preceding *ἀσθενείς*. Harnack says "*ἀσθενοῦντες* animo, *ἀσθενείς* corpore imbecilles sunt." But Lightf. replies "Both words are used indifferently either of physical or of moral weakness." This remark gives us an insight into many possibilities of error in the first century permeating Christian accounts of healing—error not arising from dishonesty, but from the blending of the literal with the metaphorical and from consequent ambiguity.

² Mk vi. 12—13.

³ Jn iv. 1—2.

186 (Mark vi. 6—13)

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

to precepts given after the Resurrection. But, if the Marcan tradition refers to a period before the Resurrection, we may suppose that the Fourth Gospel intervenes, perhaps moved by a thought of this kind: "Mark says that the Twelve, when they were sent out by Jesus before the Resurrection, 'anointed with oil.' Matthew and Luke reject this. But it means that they *baptized*, not indeed with that complete baptism which brings the *chrism* with it, but with the baptism of John administered in the name of Jesus."

§ 15. *Johannine tradition*

Passing now to Johannine tradition, we find that, although John makes no mention of the "infirm" or of "anointing with oil" either in his Gospel or in the Epistle, yet in the latter he does mention that higher kind of "anointing," a spiritual one, or *chrism*, which kept those whom he calls "little children" from the doctrine of "antichrists," and from every "lie," so that they might "abide in" the Lord and "have boldness at his coming¹." But the *chrism* does not, of itself, suffice to save them. They must "abide in" the Giver of the *chrism*². This strikes at the root of some above-mentioned heresies, which inculcated material anointings, with incantations, as a means of evading the clutches of such demons as might lie in wait for a dying soul to intercept its passage to the region of blessedness³. Toward the end of the Epistle, the writer goes even further in his discouragement of any mechanical doctrine of saving by prayer and anointing. If we ask anything according to God's will, he tells us that God "heareth us," and "if any man see

¹ 1 Jn ii. 18—28 "Little children . . . at his coming." "Anointing" here is (ib. 20, 27) *χρίσμα*, i.e. holy anointing, not *λείμμα* (from the Marcan word *λείψω*).

² 1 Jn ii. 27 *μὴνέτε ἐν αὐτῷ*, followed by *καὶ οὖν, τεκνία, μὴνέτε ἐν αὐτῷ*—whether the first *μὴνέτε* is indicative or imperative—in any case expresses, as a whole, a very emphatic warning.

³ See above, p. 177, n. 2.

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

his brother sinning a sin not unto death, he shall ask." But it is added "There is a sin unto death, not concerning this do I say that he should make request¹." In this, and in the context, there is a vagueness, and a reticence, that are very perplexing; but the words become less obscure if regarded as a protest against immoral formalism and in behalf of instinctive and spiritual morality. They appear to illustrate, and to be illustrated by, the saying peculiar to the Fourth Gospel, "Whose soever sins ye retain they are retained." There are circumstances where we are to be quiet and to believe in God, but not to pray. "A man is not to pray, even for 'his brother,' in such terms as go against his conscience, and against the testimony of the Holy Spirit within him"—this appears to be the meaning of the Johannine warning. The necessity of such a warning throws light on the degeneracy of many Christians at the time when the Epistle was written, and on the probability that "the anointing of the infirm with oil," mentioned by Mark alone of the Evangelists, had been gravely abused. John does not say this, nor does he say anything definitely negative to forbid such abuse. But he directs our attention to that higher kind of anointing, the *chrism*, the anointing with the Holy Spirit, which we received from the Lord, and which will abide in us if we abide in Him².

¹ 1 Jn v. 14—16.

² No attempt has been made in this chapter to answer the very natural question, "Why does Mark omit—what James inserts—that the anointing with oil was '*in the name of the Lord*'?" On this see *Son* 3534 d. The Hebrew for "oil" is easily confused, and is once (Prov. xxvii. 16) actually confused by LXX, with the Hebrew for "name." If the original said, "They anointed many (a) *with oil* (b) *in the NAME*," i.e. "name of the Lord," the similarity of (a) and (b) might induce Mark to omit the latter, thus reducing the tradition to the level of a mere sanitary or medical anointing. This Matthew and Luke might naturally reject.

Also, the ambiguity of expressions bearing on the Resurrection has been merely touched on. It will be more fitly discussed when we come (Mk xii. 18—27) to the controversy between Jesus and the

THE SENDING OF THE APOSTLES

Sadducees on that subject. The Pauline Epistles recognise that even in the Church of Corinth (1 Cor. xv. 12, comp. 2 Tim. ii. 18) some said that there was no resurrection, perhaps meaning that they had already "risen" in baptism, according to the words of the Christian song (Eph. v. 14) "*Awake (or, arise) (ἰγρυπε) thou that sleepest, and rise up (ἀνάστα) from the dead, and Christ shall dawn on thee.*" John exhibits Jesus Himself as twice using such ambiguous language on subjects of this kind that His disciples were deceived. He said "Lazarus is fallen asleep" (Jn xi. 11) and they thought He meant it literally; but He meant "Lazarus is dead." He also said to Martha (ib. xi. 23) "Thy brother shall rise up (ἀναστήσεται)" and Martha replied (ib. xi. 24) "I know that he will rise up in the rising up in the last day"; but He meant more than that.

Some critics may say that John describes Jesus as deliberately and gratuitously mystifying the disciples. But perhaps they might change their minds if they realised the variety of Christian thought in the first century as to the time, place, and manner of the general resurrection. It is manifest in the Epistles. It is manifest also in Revelation (xx. 5—6) which speaks of "the first resurrection," to be followed by a "second death." Realising this, many may feel that the Fourth Evangelist wrote with wisdom as well as with a deep love of fundamental truth. It is probable that Jesus did, as a fact, use ambiguous terms, feeling that death was "a sleep" and that resurrection was a spiritual union with the Father. On both sides, and in opposite directions, Christian extremists hardened Christ's metaphorical and prophetic language into materialistic dogmas. John pointed out, between the two extremes, a midway path of spiritual faith, faith in One who said—or rather meant and taught in substance, for He did not probably (*Proclam.* Pref. p. xii) use the exact words—(Jn xi. 25) "I am the resurrection and the life."

CHAPTER VII

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

[Mark vi. 14—29]

§ I. *What was said after the Baptist's death*

THE parallel texts given below, relating what was said after the Baptist's death about Jesus, differ in such a way as to shew early confusion of traditional phrases, assigned to different speakers, or placed in different contexts¹.

For example, the saying that John was "*risen from the dead*" is attributed by Mark (probably) to the people first, and

¹ Mk vi. 14—16
(R.V.)

(14) And king Herod heard [thereof]; for his name had become known: and he (*some anc. auth. they*) said, John the Baptist (*lit. the Baptizer*) is risen (*ἐγέρθη*) from the dead, and therefore do these powers work in him.

(15) But others said, It is Elijah. And others said, [It is] a prophet, [even] as one of the prophets.

(16) But Herod, when he heard [thereof], said, John, whom I beheaded, he (*οὗτος*) is risen (*ἐγέρθη*).

Mt. xiv. 1—2
(R.V.)

(1) At that season Herod the tetrarch heard the report concerning Jesus,

(2) And said unto his servants, This is John the Baptist; he (*αὐτός*) is risen (*ἐγέρθη*) from the dead; and therefore do these powers work in him.

Lk. ix. 7—9
(R.V.)

(7) Now Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was done: and he was much perplexed, because that it was said by some, that John was risen (*ἐγέρθη*) from the dead;

(8) And by some, that Elijah had appeared; and by others, that one of the old prophets was risen again (*ἀνίστη*).

(9) And Herod said, John I beheaded: but who is this, about whom I hear such things? And he sought to see him.

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

secondly to Herod¹. Matthew mentions it only once, and then assigns it to Herod, adding that he said it "to his servants²." Luke mentions it only once, but assigns it, not to Herod but to "some" ("he was much perplexed because that it was said by some³")—whom presumably Herod heard saying it. Luke adds, as one of the popular rumours, "that one of the old prophets was *risen-again*"—where the sense seems to demand that "*risen-again*" should mean "*risen from the dead*⁴." Mark concludes with Herod's own words "*The John whom I beheaded—this [same John] is risen,*" where he does not say "*risen from*

¹ Mk vi. 14—16 reading *ἔλεγον* with W.H. txt '*ἔλεγον*'. So Field *Op. Norw.* ad loc.: "And king Herod heard [thereof]; (for his name had become known: and they" [*i.e.* folk] "said, John... But others said...; and others said...). But Herod, when he heard [thereof], said, John, whom I beheaded, the same (*οὗτος*, see Mt. xxi. 42, Jn iii. 26) is risen." Field says "The sentence is suspended, in order to introduce the opinions of the people, and taken up again at vi. 16."

² Mt. xiv. 2 *εἶπεν τοῖς παῖσιν αὐτοῦ*. This would explain how it came to be known. It was not a soliloquy. Herod's guilty conscience forced him to say it aloud to those about him.

³ If *εἶπεν τοῖς παῖσιν* were written *εἶπεν ἐν τοῖς παῖσιν*, "*they said, among his servants,*" this would correspond to the Marcan *ἔλεγον*, "*they said,*" and *ἐν τοῖς παῖσιν* would be a way of adding "*in Herod's own palace.*"

⁴ Lk. ix. 8 *προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη* (not *ἠγέρθη*). But it may mean "one of [the rank of] the old prophets has arisen." The parall. Mk vi. 15 has *προφήτης ὡς εἰς τῶν προφητῶν*, "a [new] prophet as [great as] one of the [old] prophets." Mark's insertion of *ὡς* avoids the suggestion of a resurrection from the dead.

The preceding *Ἡλίας ἐφάνη* in Lk. ix. 8 is not the same as *Ἡλίας ἑφθῆ* or *ἀνέστη*. It is perhaps used with allusion to Sir. xlviii. 1 "Then stood up Elias the prophet as fire, and his word burned like a lamp." Comp. Jn v. 35 "he [*i.e.* John the Baptist] was the lamp that burneth [*i.e.* is burned] and shineth," *ὁ λύχνος ὁ καίόμενος καὶ φαίνειν*. Even when Luke is describing idle popular talk, he perhaps prefers not to write that Jesus "*is Elias*," but rather to use a phrase that suggests "*shone forth*" as well as "*appeared*" (comp. Lk. i. 17 "in the spirit and power of Elias") so as to imply, not identity of person, but similarity of glory.

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

the dead" as above, but "risen"; and the parallel Luke has "*John I beheaded: but who is this...?*"¹

It will be found in the next section that the Lucan word "*much-perplexed*," applied here to Herod's perplexity *after John's death*, recurs in Mark in a shorter form, "*perplexed*"—but applied to Herod's relations *with his living prisoner*, John, and probably in quite a different sense². It will also be found that, whereas Mark describes Herod as "*fearing John*" (that is, as respecting him) and as "keeping him safe," the parallel Matthew says that Herod would have put John to death, but "*he feared the multitude*." These confusions, and the fact that in all the Synoptists prominence is given to Herod—a name never mentioned in the Fourth Gospel—might lead us to anticipate that John would not intervene here in any way, directly or indirectly. He generally intervenes where Luke differs from Mark. But here Luke agrees with Mark more closely than Matthew does. That is another reason for not expecting Johannine intervention.

There are two sentences, however, one in Mark, and one in Mark and Matthew, as to which we might expect Johannine intervention because Luke omits them. The first is "for his name had become manifest." This seems to mean that the name of Jesus had been unknown to Herod, or obscure, up to this time, but that now—after the death of John the Baptist, and after Jesus had sent out the Twelve to preach and heal—it became, or had become, so far manifest that Herod heard of

¹ If Mark's original had some brief expression like "Whom I beheaded, John—this [is] he," it might branch out into the present Marcan and Lucan texts. For clearness, (1) Mark might supply "is risen" (shortened as a repetition of the previous "risen from the dead"), (2) Luke, taking the sentence interrogatively, and regarding the relative as an error for the interrogative, might read "Who—[for] I have beheaded John—is this?" Then he might supply "about whom I hear such things."

² Lk. ix. 7 διηπόρει, Mk vi. 20 ἡπόρει. See p. 199 foll.

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

it¹. This is altered by Matthew into "Herod... had heard the report about Jesus²," without any previous contextual mention of the works of the Twelve. Luke substitutes a perfectly neutral phrase "heard all the things that were being done," that is, done by the Apostles, who are described in the previous verse as "healing everywhere³."

The second sentence is, in Mark and Matthew, "*For this cause the [miraculous] powers work-inwardly in him [i.e. in Jesus]⁴,*" where the "cause" has been previously expressed, in Mark by "John the baptizer is raised from the dead," but in Matthew by "This is John the Baptist, he [himself] is raised from the dead."

In both these cases the Fourth Gospel appears to intervene. As to the former, it tells us that even before the arrest of the Baptist, Jesus was making more converts than those made by John, and that this fact was known to the Pharisees⁵, so that

¹ Mk vi. 14 *ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρῴδης, φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*. We are not told *what* Herod "heard," but Mark's text suggests that it was the previously mentioned wonders worked by the apostles (Mk vi. 13). If they were worked (comp. Jas. v. 14) "in the name" of their Master, then the meaning would be "For by reason of the works performed in *His name*, the name of Jesus became manifest."

"*He*" (meaning Jesus) has not been mentioned since Mk vi. 10 "*and he said unto them.*" Hence "*for his name* had become known" presents itself very abruptly to the reader. It is likely to have been altered by Matthew and Luke on that account, apart from other reasons.

² Mt. xiv. 1 *ἤκουσεν... τὴν ἀκοὴν Ἰησοῦ*. R.V. "*report*," but A.V. "*fame*," both here and in Mt. iv. 24 *ἀπῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν*. Some word between "*report*" and "*fame*" is needed to express *ἀκοή* in this context.

³ Lk. ix. 7 *ἤκουσεν τὰ γινόμενα πάντα*, referring to *ib.* ix. 6 ... *θεραπεύοντες πανταχοῦ*.

⁴ Mk vi. 14 (sim. Mt. xiv. 2) *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ*.

⁵ Jn iv. 1. Comp. iii. 22, which implies that the disciples of Christ, at that time, when baptizing in Christ's name, or under Christ's direction, remained in His neighbourhood.

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

some time before the Baptist's death, the "name" of Jesus would probably be "manifest" to all those who knew the name of the Baptist. As to the latter—the notion that Christ's miracles were in some way the result of the Baptist's rising from the dead—the Fourth Gospel puts into the mouth of "many" of the people words that expose its absurdity: "And many came unto him [*i.e.* Jesus] and they said, *John indeed did no sign*, but all things whatsoever John spake of this man were true¹."

Luke, in this description of idle sayings about the Baptist and Jesus, inserts a saying that Jesus was Elijah, and another that He was an ancient prophet risen again. Herein he resembles or follows Mark. The Fourth Gospel represents the Baptist as being expressly questioned whether he was "Elijah," and whether he was "the prophet," and as returning to both questions an express negative². It also indirectly meets the absurd notion that "power" passed out of the Baptist into Jesus by teaching, in effect, that the power, or nature, of Jesus was of a different kind from the Baptist's. The Baptist's last words (it says) were that Jesus "must increase" while he himself "must decrease³." But this, the Evangelist implies, did not mean that Jesus was to receive, in larger measure, similar power to the Baptist's. The power was to be of a different kind. The Baptist, though the friend of the Bridegroom, was "of the earth" whereas Jesus was "from above⁴." The same thing is said later on by Jesus Himself in a different metaphor, describing John as "the lamp that burneth and shineth" whereas Jesus is "the light of the world⁵."

¹ Jn x. 41.

² Jn i. 21.

³ Jn iii. 30.

⁴ Jn iii. 31.

⁵ Jn v. 35 καίμενος (*Joh. Gr.* 2275 b), viii. 12.

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

§ 2. *The cause of the Baptist's death*¹

The part alleged to have been played by Herodias and her daughter in bringing about the Baptist's death is not mentioned

¹ Mk vi. 17—29
(R.V.)

(17) For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for the sake of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife: for he had married her.

(18) For John said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.

(19) And Herodias set herself against him, and desired to kill him; and she could not;

(20) For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a righteous man and a holy, and kept him safe. And when he heard him, he was much perplexed (*many anc. auth. did many things*); and he heard him gladly.

(21) And when a convenient day was come, that Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords, and the high captains (*lit. chiliarchs*), and the chief men of Galilee;

(22) And when the daughter of Herodias (*some anc. auth. his daughter Herodias*) herself came in and danced, she (*or,*

Mt. xiv. 3—12
(R.V.)

(3) For Herod had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison for the sake of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife.

(4) For John said unto him, It is not lawful for thee to have her.

(5) And when he would have put him to death, he feared the multitude, because they counted him as a prophet.

(6) But when Herod's birthday came,

the daughter of Herodias danced in the midst, and pleased Herod.

(7) Whereupon he promised with

Lk. iii. 18—20
(R.V.)

(18) With many other exhortations therefore preached he good tidings (*or, the gospel*) unto the people;

(19) But Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias his brother's wife, and for all the evil things which Herod had done,

(20) Added yet this above all, that he shut up John in prison.

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

by Josephus. He says merely that Herod Antipas imprisoned and executed the prophet because he was too influential with

Mk. vi. 17—29
(R.V.) *contd.*

it) pleased Herod and them that sat at meat with him; and the king said unto the damsel, Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt, and I will give it thee.

(23) And he sware unto her, whatsoever thou shalt ask of me, I will give it thee, unto the half of my kingdom.

(24) And she went out, and said unto her mother, What shall I ask? And she said, The head of John the Baptist (*lit.* the Baptizer).

(25) And she came in straightway with haste unto the king, and asked, saying, I will that thou forthwith give me in a charger the head of John the Baptist (*lit.* the Baptizer).

(26) And the king was exceeding sorry; but for the sake of his oaths, and of them that sat at meat, he would not reject her.

(27) And straightway the king sent forth a soldier of his guard, and commanded to bring his head: and he went and beheaded him in the prison,

(28) And brought his head in a charger,

Mt. xiv. 3—12
(R.V.) *contd.*

an oath to give her whatsoever she should ask.

(8) And she, being put forward by her mother, saith, Give me here in a charger the head of John the Baptist.

(9) And the king was grieved; but for the sake of his oaths, and of them which sat at meat with him, he commanded it to be given;

(10) And he sent, and beheaded John in the prison.

(11) And his head was brought in a charger, and given to the damsel: and she brought it to her mother.

(12) And his dis-

Lk. iii. 18—20
(R.V.)

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

the people¹. But we cannot doubt that Mark's story about Herod's oath—possibly a prearranged "oath"—represents what people in Galilee believed to have been (and what probably was) the historical fact—that the life of the last of the Jewish prophets was openly and publicly sacrificed for a dance². This belief must have powerfully influenced the multitude in their feelings and expectations about Jesus. Many patriotic Jews among His admirers would be alienated from Him when His tacit refusal to make any effort at a rescue resulted in the prophet's brutal and ignominious execution. As soon as Christ's own disciples heard of the news of the murder, the first impulse of many of them would be to exclaim "Surely our Master must do something now. Surely He will avenge the Prophet on this false king, this 'king Herod³.' Why do we not make the Son of David king?"

Mk vi. 17—29
(R.V.) *contd.*

and gave it to the damsel; and the damsel gave it to her mother.

(29) And when his disciples heard [thereof], they came and took up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb.

Mt. xiv. 3—12
(R.V.) *contd.*

ciples came, and took up the corpse, and buried him; and they went and told Jesus.

Lk. iii. 18—20
(R.V.)

¹ See *Son 3338b* quoting Josephus *Ant.* xviii. 5. 2, and adding "Very likely there was an 'oath,' but a prearranged 'oath.'"

² It has been urged that the daughter of Herodias could not have been young enough to be a *κρηάριον* at the time of the dancing. But see Schürer i. ii. 28 for the facts that induce him to conclude "Just the weakest point in the Gospel story is proved on more careful examination to be not improbable."

³ Why does Mk vi. 14 foll. call Herod Antipas "king"—and that, too, five times? Everyone knew that he was never "king," except in a will made by his father (Joseph. *Bell.* i. 32. 7) and afterwards (*ib.* i. 33. 7) cancelled. When Antipas, persuaded by Herodias, came to Rome with a petition to be made "king" (*ib.* ii. 9. 6) he was deprived of his tetrarchy and banished to Spain. In his own palace, he was perhaps called "king" by his courtiers. If so,

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

This would accord with the project—recorded in the Fourth Gospel alone as occurring about this time—to make Jesus a “king¹.” Jesus frustrated it by withdrawing. Soon afterwards we hear that many of His disciples abandoned Him. The Gospel says it was because of Christ’s “hard saying”—the doctrine of the giving of His flesh and blood for the world². But that does not exclude other, and perhaps more powerful causes. If Jesus had put Himself at the head of a band of Galileans bent on avenging the Baptist, the mass of His followers would not have been deterred from following Him by any “hard sayings.” They would abandon Jesus (we may feel sure) not only because He seemed to talk dreams like Ezekiel the prophet of parables³, but also because He did not do deeds, such as they expected from the Messianic Son of David.

These Marcan details, though historically true and dramatically interesting, tend to divert attention from Jesus to the Baptist. Mark may most accurately represent the contemporary gossip of Galilee laying the blame for the prophet’s death rather on Herodias than on Herod; yet we cannot be surprised that in subsequent Gospels his early narrative was condensed or omitted as not being history. Luke, the historian, wholly omits it. Yet there remains one faint trace of Luke’s recognition of Mark’s narrative in one tell-tale similarity of phrase. It lies in Luke’s and Mark’s accounts of Herod’s “perplexity,” touched on above, but worthy of a little more notice here, because it may give us insight into the original form of the narrative.

Mark speaks of frequent interviews between Herod and the Baptist in language that recalls the interviews between Paul

there may be a tinge of irony in Mark’s fivefold mention of the title. Comp. Paul’s speech to a real “king” in Acts xxvi. 2—27 and note how he repeats “king” six times. Jews in the first century were keenly alive to the distinction between a “king” and a “tetrarch.”

¹ Jn vi. 15.

² Jn vi. 60.

³ Ezek. xx. 49 “They say of me, Doth he not speak parables?”

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

and Felix in the Acts, and also conversations between Rabbis and Roman Emperors mentioned in the Talmuds¹. In Paul's case, though Felix was at first "terrified," the result was that he kept Paul in prison for two years and left him there, after repeatedly trying to get money out of him. His conscience does not appear to have been touched. The Rabbis are often described as being subjected in interviews to searching questions, of the nature of a "dilemma," "poser," "puzzle," or "perplexity," from which they emerge triumphant.

Now the verb (*aporein*) here used by Mark about Herod is used, from Aristotle downwards, to mean "raise a difficulty (or, objection)" in a philosophic discussion². It is used transitively by Irenaeus to describe how Jesus (according to certain heretics) "posed" the Pharisees by a question³. Clement of Alexandria says that an Indian Gymnosophist was "posed" by Alexander with the query "How shall a man best attain love?" The Clementine Homilies use the word (along with "shouting down") as meaning "bring to a standstill".

This interpretation of *aporein* is consistent with Mark's addition of "*many things*," which he often uses with verbs of teaching, exhorting, etc., to imply repeated utterances, and not to mean "much" in the sense of "*deeply*". The difficulty

¹ See Acts xxiv. 24—7 and Levy i. 33, and 107—8 (on Hadrian and Antoninus).

² See L.S. and the Index to Plutarch which gives ἀπορεῖν as "disputare" (as well as "dubitare"). Ἀπόρημα means an "objection" thus raised.

³ Iren. i. 20. 2.

Clem. Alex. 759 ἀπορηθεὶς (Clark "posed with the query"), comp. ib. 788 τὸ πρὸς τῶν αἱρετικῶν ἀπορούμενον "the dilemma put by heretics."

⁴ Clem. Hom. i. 11 κατασιωπῆν καὶ ἀπορεῖν αὐτὸν...ὡς βάρβαρον τινα δαιμονῶντα.

⁵ Comp. πολλά with verbs of speech in Mk i. 45, iv. 2, vi. 34, xv. 3. Perhaps also we should render Mk ix. 26 πολλὰ σπαράξας "having repeatedly convulsed him." In Mk v. 10, παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλά implies both repetition and urgency.

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

presented by the Marcan *aporein* has probably caused Matthew to omit it and has certainly caused many authorities to read it as *poiein* ("he *did* many things," i.e. did good deeds at the Baptist's suggestion)¹. And the same difficulty has probably caused Luke to prefix *dia* to *aporein*, so as to mean "*much-perplexed*," and to transfer it to another context where Herod is said to have been "*much perplexed*," not by what the living prophet said to him, but by what people said about the dead prophet and his apparent successor, Jesus of Nazareth².

Mark's narrative bears the stamp of consistent truth, not necessarily historical truth, but popular truth, noised about, first in Galilee and then in the Church at Rome. In Rome, the death of the Baptist by the orders of Herod but at the instigation of Herodias, could not but remind Roman Christians of the death of Cicero by the orders of Mark Antony but (as people said) at the instigation of his wife Fulvia³. According to Mark and Mark alone, Herod exclaimed "The John whom I beheaded is risen⁴." This was the same John whom he had kept as an interesting prisoner, "hearing him with pleasure," though

¹ So R.V. marg. and inferior Gk MSS with Syr. and Lat. versions. So Daniel (iv. 27), in effect, suggests to Nebuchadnezzar that he will be wise to do "many things," especially almsgiving.

² Lk. ix. 7 *διηπόρει*. Comp. Acts v. 24, x. 17 *διηπόρουν* (-ει), and *ib.* ii. 12 *διηπόρουντο* denoting perplexity about marvels apparently supernatural. *Διαπορέω* (Steph. *Thes.*) has the same meanings as *ἀπορέω* but is not so often used as *ἀπορέω* to denote a philosophic and dispassionate "objection."

³ See Mayor's Notes on Juvenal x. 120 "'It is said that Antony set Cicero's head before the table at his meal, till he had glutted himself with the sight.' Fulvia, another Herodias [Hieron. in Rufin. iii. 42], spat upon the head, took it on her knees, and stabbed the tongue with her hair pin, D Cass. xlvii. 8 §§ 3—4." Cicero had alluded (2 Philipp. v. 11) to Fulvia as the "fate" of her three husbands, Antony being the third. This makes Fulvia's act probable, though Plutarch omits it.

⁴ Mk vi. 16 *ἡγήθη*. 'Εκ νεκρῶν has to be supplied from vi. 14 *ἐγγιγνέσθαι ἐκ νεκρῶν* and is inserted in the text by A.V. following some MSS.

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

"raising many objections" to his doctrines. There is an antecedent probability in such a cry of the conscience as Mark seems to attribute to Herod: "I took pleasure in arguing against his doctrine, and against the doctrine of the rising of the dead, and now God has raised him up to punish me for his death¹."

Among minute indications of the early and popular character of Mark's whole narrative, there is (as has been noted above) his repeated use of "king," applied to Herod²—a title altered by Matthew and Luke into "tetrarch," though Matthew subsequently falls (once) into the use of the Marcan title. But it is to the internal evidence of the narrative as a whole that we must mainly look for the demonstration of its early date—to its disordered sentences, its digressiveness, and its disproportionate diffuseness, natural in some Petrine story—especially if Peter had been one of the Baptist's disciples—but unsuited for Luke the historian, and for John the Evangelist of the Word of God compared with whom the Baptist was but "a voice."

Luke deals very freely with such Marcan fragments as he selects. As for Herodias, he merely makes mention of her marriage in connection with "all the evil things that Herod had done" and places it before the baptism of Jesus and at the end of his account of John the Baptist, whom, he says, Herod "shut up in prison³." As for the Baptist's death, the only Lucan mention of it is in "John have I beheaded," discussed above. There is no suggestion that Herod said anything about a resurrection from the dead. Indeed the notion that he said this and that his conscience was stricken is inconsistent with

¹ In Matthew, Herod says "he is risen from the dead" but not "whom I beheaded." In Luke, Herod says "John I beheaded" but not "he is risen from the dead." Mark has both.

² Mk vi. 14, 22, 25, 26, 27 βασιλεύς, Mt. xiv. 1 and Lk. ix. 7 τετραάρχης, Mt. xiv. 9 βασιλεύς. See above, p. 197, n. 3.

³ Lk. iii. 18—20.

JOHN THE BAPTIST'S DEATH

what follows "But who is this about whom I hear such things? And he sought to see him." These words prepare the way for a tradition peculiar to Luke, and inserted by him much later on, that Herod did actually see Jesus and "mocked him with his men of war"—a story probably resulting from a misunderstanding¹, but still affording evidence as to Luke's view, namely, that Herod Antipas had not been touched by any remorse for the execution of the Baptist.

The Johannine method resembles the Lucan in the brevity of its only allusion to the Baptist's imprisonment ("John was not yet cast into prison²"). But it differs in this respect, that it makes no mention at all of "beheading" or of execution in any form. If the works of Josephus and the Synoptists had perished we should never have known from the Fourth Gospel how or when the Baptist died. We should have known only that his last recorded words were about Jesus "He must increase, but I must decrease³."

¹ See *Clus* 55—80, and *Son* 3183 *c—d* on "Luke's attitude to Herod Antipas."

² Jn iii. 24.

³ Jn iii. 30 [Jn iii. 31—6 is probably the Evangelist's comment, and not the words of the Baptist, see *Joh. Gr.* Pref. p. viii]. In Luke, the last recorded words of the Baptist are (Lk. vii. 19) "Art thou he that is to come, or look we for another?"

CHAPTER VIII

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

[Mark vi. 29—44, viii. 1—9, viii. 14—21]

[See p. 208, n. 1]

§ 1. *The complexity of the evidence*

THE study of Christ's miracles of feeding is complicated by Jewish peculiarities not only of thought but also of expression. For example, the Feeding of the Five Thousand challenges some kind of comparison (such as we find in the Fourth Gospel) with the giving of the manna in the wilderness¹. Now concerning the latter it is said in Exodus "The people shall go out and gather (lit.) the word of the day in its day²." That is to say, the amount necessary for the day was to be gathered on that same day. It was also to be eaten on that same day. None of it was to be left till next morning³.

According to the texts of our English Versions, the Lord's Prayer, instead of saying "Give us *the bread of the day in its day*," says "Give us *this day our daily bread*," or "Give us *day by day our daily bread*⁴." But these appear to be Christian

¹ Jn vi. 31.

² Exod. xvi. 4. The Heb. for "word" often means "thing" or "matter." LXX omits it, τὸ τῆς ἡμέρας εἰς ἡμέραν, Vulg. "quae sufficient per singulos dies." Aq. inserts αὐτῆς after ἡμέραν.

³ Exod. xvi. 19.

⁴ Mt. vi. 11 τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὲς ἡμῖν σήμερον, Lk. xi. 3 τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν. The pres. imperat. denotes continuous action. A.V. marg. in Lk. has "for the day" instead of "day by day." R.V. marg. in both has "Gr. our bread for the coming day" instead of "our daily bread."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

attempts to render in Greek some Aramaic expression corresponding to the Hebrew of Exodus. For Origen tells us that the Greek for "daily," *epiousios*, did not exist till it came into use in the Lord's Prayer. It is a word of irregular formation and doubtful meaning of which he gives two interpretations, (1) "sufficient for our existence," (2) "fit for future [time]," that is, "fit for the next world¹." Matthew makes the prayer one for a special giving and for a special day, "*Give* (aorist) us *to-day*"; Luke makes it a prayer for continuous giving for every day, "*Give* (pres.) us [*continually*] *day by day*²."

The Jews themselves differed in their interpretations of the passage in Exodus. R. Joshua said that they were to collect from one day to the next as one does from the sabbath-preparation-day to the sabbath itself; R. Eleazar denied this³. In a prayer of this kind, "the bread of the day" might have meanings varying with the time of day when it was uttered and with the time from which one reckoned "the day" as beginning, whether at sunrise as in nature, or at midnight as among the moderns, or at sunset as among the Jews. There are good reasons for concluding that, in the Lord's Prayer, the Greek word that we render "*daily*" meant "*belonging to the day that is now coming on*," which would be specially appropriate to a prayer uttered in the early morning. But the conclusion could not easily be reached without studying the ancient precept in Exodus⁴.

¹ See Origen *De Orat.* § 27.

² Comp. Lk. ix. 23 "take up his cross *daily*," where the parall. Mk viii. 34, Mt. xvi. 24 omit "*daily*."

³ See *Mechilt.* on Exod. xvi. 4.

⁴ In Exodus (xvi. 13, 14) the manna comes with "the morning" and "the dew." See Steph. *Thes.* iii. 1460 for passages shewing that *ἡ ἐπιούσα*, sometimes without *ἡμέρα*, means the day that is "coming on" and will arrive in a few hours or minutes, where *αὔριον*, "the morrow," would sound too formal. Also comp. Prov. xxvii. 1 (Heb.) "Boast not thyself of (lit.) [the] day [that is] to-morrow (LXX *τὰ εἰς αὔριον*), for thou knowest not what a day (LXX *ἡ ἐπιούσα*) may bring forth." Here, and here alone, the LXX has

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Passing to the Gospels we find that whereas in Mark (followed by Luke) Jesus is described as sending out the

ἡ ἐπιούσα with Heb. equiv. (in Prov. iii. 28 it is corrupt) and the meaning is declared by Rashi to be "*to-day*" ("forsitan *hodie* accidet aliquid mali quod aboleat cogitationes de die crastino"); Walton also renders the Targ. כּדוֹי as "*hodierna dies*." R. Eleazar said (*Mechill.* on Exod. xvi. 4) "He that hath what he shall eat *to-day*, and saith, 'What shall I eat to-morrow?' is of little faith." From ἐπιούσα there appears to have been constructed an irregular adj. ἐπιούσιος meaning "*belonging to the coming day*." In ἐπιούσα, "*on-coming*," ἐπι means "*on*"; but in many compound words it means "*fit*," as in ἐπιτελής, "*fit to please*," and ἐπιούσιος may possibly have conveyed to those who first used it a duplicated meaning, "*fit* (or, *sufficient*), for the *on-coming* day."

Ἐπιοῦσα occurs in LXX elsewhere only in Deut. xxxii. 29 εἰς τὸν ἐπιούσα χρόνον, Heb. "their latter-end (אחרייתם)," Aq. εἰς ἐσχάτην αὐτῶν, and 1 Chr. xx. 1 ἐν τῷ ἐπιούσῃ ἔτει, Heb. "at the time of the return of the year," Vulg. "post anni circulum," Syr. "anno sequenti," A.V. "after the year was expired."

These variations may be illustrated from Jas. ii. 15 τῆς ἐφημέρου τροφῆς, R.V. "*of daily food*," on which Field says "More correctly, '*of the day's supply of food*,' as distinguished from τῆς καθ' ἡμέραν τροφῆς." These two renderings, in effect, correspond to Matthew's and Luke's renderings of the petition for bread in the Lord's Prayer. And it is probable that the original Aramaic of that petition is best represented by Matthew, and is based on the precept about the manna "*the word of the day in its day*," that is, "*the day's supply in the same day*."

Field (on Jas. ii. 15) quotes from Menander a line contrasting the life that is ἐφήμερος, i.e. "*dependent on the day's supply*," with the life that has περισσία, i.e. "*superabundance*." From this it follows that ἐπιούσιος, when meaning ἐφήμερος, might suggest a popular contrast with περισσός, so that, as the latter implied "*above sufficiency*," the former might mean "*fit for sufficiency*."

Some confusion of this kind might be facilitated by the Hebraized use of οὐσία to mean (Levy i. 43 b) "*property*" in various senses.

But minor causes of varying interpretation must not divert us from the main and almost sufficient cause, namely, that the petition originally referred to the saying in the Law, "*the word of the day in its day*." The same ambiguity that varied the interpretation of the clause in the Law might also vary its interpretation in the Gospel. That the "*bread*" was (at all events primarily) spiritual may be inferred from the context in the Prayer and from Christ's doctrine as a whole.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Apostles with the precept "take no bread," Matthew omits the prohibition, and the Didaché limits it ("no bread except [to suffice] till a lodging is found for the night")¹. The only other Marcan instance of "bread" in words of Christ is in the saying "It is not fit to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs²." Reasons have been given for thinking that these words may have belonged, in the original tradition, to the disciples, and that they have been assigned to Jesus by error³. But in any case they are metaphorical and do not clearly shew what is beneath the metaphor⁴.

We may fairly say that we do not find in Mark a single instance where Jesus is described as inculcating a doctrine of Bread. And yet we know, not only from the Lord's Prayer, but also from other passages in Matthew and Luke, as well as from copious discourses in John, that such a doctrine must have existed. Mark seems to hint at some hidden truth or mystery when he says concerning the disciples, shortly after the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Walking on the Sea, "For they understood not in the matter of the loaves, but their heart had been hardened (*or*, made callous⁵)." But he does not tell us what the mystery was.

¹ These passages, which have been discussed above (p. 159) under Mk vi. 8, are mentioned here merely in order to shew the necessity of discussing verbal detail in Mark.

² Mk vii. 27. This statement refers only to *ἄpros* sing. Mk viii. 17 has the pl., and the literal rendering is "ye have not *loaves*."

³ See *Son* 3353 (iv) *a* foll.

⁴ The woman's desire was that Jesus should heal her daughter. How this healing could "take the bread of the children" away from the children is not clear, unless the meaning was that Christ's energy was limited, and that, if part of it were bestowed on Syrophoenicians, less would remain for Jews. More probably "*take and cast*" is rhetorically used for "*cast*," i.e. give it to the dogs as well. This is not the sort of saying that one would assign to Jesus even as a beneficent trial of the woman's faith.

⁵ Mk vi. 52 οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδιά πεπωρωμένη. On *πώρωσις*, "callousness," see *Proclamation* p. 362 foll.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

These considerations should prepare us for a more than usually patient and laborious investigation of Mark's words and phrases in connection with Christ's feeding of the multitudes, while we attempt to ascertain what was the nature of this "callousness of the heart" and what was the nature of the truth "in the matter of the loaves," which truth, in consequence of the "callousness," the disciples "understood not¹."

There will be the usual temptation to explain everything from one cause. And the cause to which many facts appear to point will be found to be poetic metaphor. But there is also the possibility of error arising from antedating post-resurrectional acts and words of Christ². And we shall have to remember that even in pre-Christian days there was already established the homely but sacred meal connected with the *Kiddûsh*, or Sanctification of the Sabbath³. It may be taken as certain that Jesus, in some form, celebrated the *Kiddûsh* on many occasions with His disciples; and it is probable that on some occasions He extended it to the sanctification of other days, and admitted strangers to the meal. Such celebrations, when related in the language of poetic metaphor—and with allusions to such admissions of thousands at a time into the Church as are described in the Acts of the Apostles—might account for much that could not be explained as the result of metaphor alone.

¹ I dismiss, as unworthy of consideration, the notion that it meant that the disciples ought to have learned from the multiplication of the loaves that Jesus could do whatever He liked, and therefore that they were culpably foolish and faithless in being astonished that He could walk upon water.

² See "Post-resurrectional" in *Indices of Son and Proclamation* and the present volume, and see *Proclam.* pp. 1, 56-7 concerning a miraculous draught of fishes, placed by Luke before, but by John after, Christ's resurrection. See also above, pp. 52-3.

³ On the *Kiddûsh*, see *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* (Oesterley and Box) p. 346 foll.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

There are no less than seven accounts of miraculous feeding in the Gospels:—(1) the Feeding of the Five Thousand, related by four evangelists, (2) that of the Four Thousand, related by two, (3) that of the seven disciples (after Christ's resurrection) related by one. Mark (followed by Matthew) besides giving two of these accounts, adds a comment¹. He represents Jesus as referring to two of the miracles thus: "When I brake the five loaves among the five thousand, how many baskets (*cophinoi*) full of broken pieces took ye up? . . . And when the seven among the four thousand, how many full baskets (*sphurides*) of broken pieces took ye up?" Here Jesus is described as distinguishing, not only the two actions and the numbers affected by them, but even the two kinds of "baskets" used on the two occasions.

Philo, in his treatise on the Feast of the Baskets—meaning the baskets of the firstfruits mentioned in Deuteronomy—says that it extended over about half the year, being "at two seasons²." He appears to mean the "season" of the corn harvest (including the barley harvest which came first in late spring) and the "season" of "fruits," strictly so called, which extended to the autumn. The Hebrew for the "basket" mentioned in Deuteronomy is different from that used by

¹ Mk vi. 29—44, after describing (a) what immediately followed the death of John the Baptist, describes (b) the Feeding of the Five Thousand; Mk viii. 1—9 describes (c) the Feeding of the Four Thousand; Mk viii. 14—21 describes (d) Jesus as reproaching the disciples for not learning what they ought to have learned from these two actions. These Marcan passages, with their parallels, will be found below, (a) p. 216, (b) pp. 269, 283, 297, 315, 336, 348, (c) pp. 263, 269, 283, 297, 315, 336, 348, (d) pp. 210—11.

² Mk viii. 19—20, Mt. xvi. 9—10, omitted by Luke.

³ See Philo ii. 298 foll. *De Fest. Coph.* § 3 where he says that the song of the baskets (*καρτάλλον*) is sung *δυσὶ καιροῖς ὁλοκλήρῃ μέρει ἡμίσει τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ*. He is referring to Deut. xxvi. 2—4 *καὶ ἐμβαλεῖς εἰς κάρταλλον . . . λήψεται ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸν κάρταλλον*. The LXX omits "all" in "all the fruits of the land," but Philo seems to assume that its inclusion is implied.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Jeremiah, speaking of the vintage, "as a grape-gatherer into the *baskets*¹." This suggests that something more than a mere literal difference between two kinds of "*baskets*" may be intended in the two Marcan narratives of feeding—possibly some allusion to the firstfruits of the cornfields and to those of the vineyards and orchards, taken metaphorically as applicable to the ingathering of converts into the Church of Christ.

§ 2. *Traces of metaphor underlying the narratives about the "baskets"*

The last-quoted words of Jesus about the two kinds of "baskets" follow a warning in Mark (and a similar one in Matthew) addressed by Jesus to the disciples, "And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod." This the disciples take literally, saying "We have no loaves." Jesus rebukes them for their literalism, reminding them of the *cophinoi* and the *sphurides* and saying "Do ye not yet understand?" In Mark the connection is obscure. But it is made clearer by Matthew, who represents Jesus as saying "How is it that ye do not perceive that I spake *not to you concerning loaves? But beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.*" Afterwards Matthew adds "Then understood they how that he bade them *not beware of the leaven of loaves, but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees.*"

This, though clear, leads us to think of metaphorical loaves as well as metaphorical leaven. If the "leaven" is the formal teaching by which the Pharisees vitiated the Law, then it would seem that the "loaves," metaphorically regarded, are the Law itself. In that case, might not the "five loaves" be the five books of the Law "broken up" and explained to the multitude, piece by piece?

¹ Jer. vi. 9, so R.V. txt, Targ., LXX, Rashi, and Jerome. In Deut. xxvi. 3, Jer. Targ. has (Etheridge) "baskets, hampers, and paper cases."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

This will be considered later on. Meanwhile we must add that there is a difficulty in the mention of a perplexity about "leaven" at a time of the year when, according to Synoptic chronology, no question of leavened or unleavened bread could arise. The Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread were not then at hand. Why should the disciples suppose that their Master warned them against literal "leaven," at a season when literal leaven was quite lawful? It is not surprising that Luke omits all the Mark-Matthew tradition about "loaves." He retains merely a warning against "leaven" as given below¹:

¹ In the parallel passages printed below, and for the most part in others printed in footnotes, R.V. text is followed (with a very few occasional deviations indicated by brackets) as being convenient for rapid reference enabling the reader to take a broad view of the subject under consideration. But in the detailed study of the Greek text, R.V. text is frequently departed from.

Mk viii. 14—21 (R.V.)

(14) And they forgot to take bread (*lit.* loaves); and they had not in the boat with them more than one loaf.

(15) And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod.

(16) And they reasoned one with another, saying, We have no bread (*lit.* loaves).

(17) And Jesus perceiving it saith unto them, Why reason ye, because ye have no bread (*lit.* loaves)? do ye not yet perceive, neither understand? have ye your heart hardened?

(18) Having eyes,

Mt. xvi. 5—12 (R.V.)

(5) And the disciples came to the other side and forgot to take bread (*lit.* loaves).

(6) And Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

(7) And they reasoned among themselves, saying, We took no bread (*lit.* loaves).

(8) And Jesus perceiving it said, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have no bread (*lit.* loaves)?

(9) Do ye not yet perceive, neither remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how

Lk. xii. 1 (R.V.)

In the meantime, when the many thousands of the multitude were gathered together, insomuch that they trode one upon another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Besides the Lucan omission of all that part of Mark which connects "leaven" with the feeding of the two multitudes, it will be seen below that there is a remarkable lacuna in Matthew. He omits "they had not in the boat with them more than one loaf." The omission is not surprising. Though Mark often deals in picturesque superfluities, few of his details are so apparently superfluous as this—if taken literally. But, if we can regard it as an ancient symbolical tradition, inserted here as if it were literally true, then it may become both intelligible and interesting. Paul speaks of "*one loaf, one body*" in connection with "*the loaf that we break*" in the Christian Eucharist¹. John also describes Jesus, after the Resurrection, as feeding seven disciples on a fish and "*a loaf*". It seems a reasonable supposition that Mark has here preserved, out of

Mk viii. 14—21 (R.V.)
contd.

see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember?

(19) When I brake the five loaves among the five thousand, how many baskets† full of broken pieces took ye up? They say unto him, Twelve.

(20) And when the seven among the four thousand, how many basketfuls† of broken pieces took ye up? And they say unto him, Seven.

(21) And he said unto them, Do ye not yet understand?

Mt. xvi. 5—12 (R.V.)
contd.

many baskets† ye took up?

(10) Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets† ye took up?

(11) How is it that ye do not perceive that I spake not to you concerning bread (*lit.* loaves)? But beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

(12) Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread (*lit.* loaves), but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

Lk. xii. 1 (R.V.)

† N.B. "Baskets," when first mentioned = *cophinoi*, when next mentioned = *sphurides*.

¹ 1 Cor. x. 16—17.

² Jn xxi. 9, 13. On the sing. "loaf," see *Son* 3422 i.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

place, a symbolical tradition of weighty and solemn meaning, of which he has misunderstood the weight and importance. This hypothesis is at all events more probable than to suppose that Mark has preserved, in its place, a literal detail that never had any importance at all. Matthew's rejection of it may then be explained because he believed it to be out of its right place, and so wrongly placed as to give a false impression which he could not correct. If this hypothesis is accepted, the Marcan detail of the "one loaf" may fairly be regarded along with its Johannine counterpart, as an instance of Johannine Intervention, where John has given the right place and the right interpretation to a tradition misplaced and misunderstood by Mark.

Now let us return to Luke's omission of the connection of "leaven"—called by him "the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy"—with the miraculous feeding. Does John fail to intervene? It might be assumed that he does fail since he nowhere mentions either "leaven" or "unleavened." But he mentions "Passover," that is, in effect, the Feast of Unleavened Bread. And, what is more, he speaks of "the Passover of the Jews," and "the Passover, the feast [so called] of the Jews," in such a way as to suggest that he contrasts "the Passover of the Jews" with "the Passover of Christians." This he does repeatedly¹. He does not indeed expressly contrast the material "leaven" cast out by the Pharisees with the spiritual "leaven" that they retained, but he does imply this distinction.

This we shall see if we put ourselves in the position of Christians of the first century. They would certainly apply Pauline language to the Lord's last Passover. "He kept it," they would say, "on the Cross, or rather He was our Passover on the Cross, so that we might *'keep the feast not with old leaven but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth'*"; but the rulers

¹ Jn ii. 13, xi. 55 τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, vi. 4 (W.H.) 'τὸ πάσχα', ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

of the Jews, His murderers, they kept it in what the Apostle Paul called '*the leaven of malice and wickedness*¹.'" Now John, toward the conclusion of his Gospel, expresses the same thought, not indeed in words, but (as often) in dramatic action. His Gospel lays ironical stress on the scrupulousness with which the rulers of the Jews, on the morning of the Crucifixion, at the very time when they were constraining Pilate to destroy Jesus by judicial murder, "entered not into the palace." Their reason was "*that they might not be defiled*, but might eat the passover²." They duly "*ate*" their "*passover*," but it was "*the passover of the Jews*." They cast out their leaven. But they *were* "*defiled*"—with the leaven of malice and wickedness.

In the light of these later Johannine utterances let us consider whether John perhaps desired to express something more than a mere chronological fact, when he prefixed to his account of the Feeding of the Five Thousand the words "*Now the Passover, the feast of the Jews*, was at hand. Jesus, therefore, lifting up his eyes, and seeing that a great multitude cometh unto him, saith unto Philip, Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat³?" This was immediately after the murder of John the Baptist. Many a Galilaean in those days would regard John as a shepherd of Israel; and Mark tells us that Jesus had compassion on the multitude because they were "as sheep

¹ 1 Cor. v. 8.

² Jn xviii. 28. See also Jn xi. 55 "*Now the passover of the Jews was at hand: and many went up... to purify themselves*," on which Origen says (Lomm. ii. 372) "The multitude did not know how to purify themselves. Wherefore, while fancying that they were offering '*their own Passover*' as a service to God, they were so far from '*purifying themselves*' that they became more accursed than they were before...." Origen says, and quotes passages to shew, that (*ib.* 371) "We must not suppose the Passover of the Lord to be also *the Passover of the Jews*; for the Passover according to the Law [of God] is that of the Lord, but the Passover of those who break the Law (*τὸν παραβῆναι*) is *that of the Jews*."

³ Jn vi. 4—5; "bread," *lit.* "loaves."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

without a shepherd¹." The Pharisees, as far as we know, had made no such protest as John the Baptist made against Herod Antipas, nor had they directly or indirectly supported the prophet. They were also plotting the death of Jesus, while professing to be the teachers of the Law, the Word of Life.

Such conduct—combined with a severe enforcement of precepts of purification—was called by Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels "hypocrisy." It was, in effect, "the leaven of malice and wickedness." The Law, as taught by such teachers, was a false parody of "bread." In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus, before the Feeding of the Five Thousand, says, "Whence shall we buy *loaves* that these may eat?" and, later on, in terms of reproach or warning, "Ye ate of the *loaves* and were satisfied²." But these are the only Johannine passages where Jesus uses the plural "*loaves*." A little later He uses the singular, which He frequently repeats, "My Father giveth you *the true bread* out of heaven³." It is John's custom to dwell on positives rather than negatives, and on truths rather than falsehoods. In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus warns His disciples negatively against "the leaven of the Pharisees" (Luke adding "which is hypocrisy"). This is the false leaven, and implies the false bread. In John, a similar warning to the multitude is included in His positive doctrine concerning "the true bread." And the words "Whence shall we buy loaves?" addressed to Philip, may convey the same warning to the disciples, a warning against those many kinds of false foods which one buys at the cost of spiritual health and life, whereas the true bread, the living bread, is bought "without money and without price⁴," coming as a gift to those who are taught by the Giver of all Good to give themselves to Him even as He gives Himself to them.

¹ Mk vi. 34. Luke (ix. 11 foll.) omits this. Matthew (xiv. 14 foll.) omits it here, but places it earlier (ix. 36).

² Jn vi. 5, 26.

³ Jn vi. 32.

⁴ Is. lv. 1, see below, p. 272.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

As regards the word "buy," in connection with food or bread, we may note here that the Synoptists use it nowhere except in the Feeding of the Five Thousand¹. There all the Evangelists have it, but with this important difference, that while the Three ascribe it in various forms ("are we to buy," "that they may buy") to the disciples, the Fourth ascribes it to Jesus, associating Himself with the disciples—"Whence are we to buy loaves?" Mark, alone of the Synoptists, has "*buy loaves*." It is highly probable that this Johannine repetition of the Marcan "*buy loaves*" in what seems² an entirely different context is deliberate. The probability is increased by the fact that, in the same context, John agrees with Mark, against Matthew and Luke, in mentioning "two hundred pennyworth of loaves," as uttered by a disciple or disciples. These two details, even if they stood alone, would suffice to prove that John had in view Marcan traditions. But they do not stand alone. They are parts of a web of traditions, indicating an unusual abundance of complex evidence, bearing on the Rule of Johannine Intervention, and, ultimately, on the historical fact at the bottom of all these narratives.

¹ Ἀγοράζει occurs in Mk vi. 36 with εἰ φάγωσιν and *ib.* 37 with ἀπορῶν, in Mt. xiv. 15, Lk. ix. 13 with βρῆματα. It occurs also in Jn iv. 8 with ὑποφάς and vi. 5 with ἀπορῶν.

² "Seems," because it is conceivable that John does not reject, but supplements, the Synoptic traditions about buying. Perhaps he regards Jesus as first overhearing, and then receiving, complaints from His disciples ("How are we to buy?"). These He repeats in a kindly "tempting" of Philip: "Yes, truly, how are we to buy?"

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 3. *The immediate sequel of John the Baptist's death*¹

According to Matthew, the Baptist's disciples, after burying their Master, came and "*brought word*" of his death to Jesus,

¹ Mk vi. 29—34 (R.V.)

(29) And when his disciples heard [thereof], they came and took up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb.

(30) And the apostles gather themselves together unto Jesus; and they told him all things, whatsoever they had done, and whatsoever they had taught.

(31) And he saith unto them, Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a while. For there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat.

(32) And they went away in the boat to a desert place apart.

(33) And [the people] saw them going, and many knew [them], and they ran there together on foot (*or*, by land) from all the cities, and outwent them.

(34) And he came forth and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them,

Mt. xiv. 12—14 (R.V.)

(12) And his disciples came, and took up the corpse, and buried him; and they went and told Jesus.

(13) Now when Jesus heard [it], he withdrew from thence in a boat, to a desert place apart: and when the multitudes heard [thereof], they followed him on foot (*or*, by land) from the cities.

(14) And he came forth, and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, and healed their sick.

Comp. Mt. ix. 36

But when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion for them, because they were dis-

Lk. ix. 10—11 (R.V.)

(10) And the apostles, when they were returned, declared unto him what things they had done. And he took them, and withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida.

(11) But the multitudes perceiving it followed him: and he welcomed them, and spake to them of the kingdom of God, and them that had need of healing he healed.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

who, on "hearing [of it]," withdrew into a desert place. But according to Mark, the Baptist's disciples, "on hearing [of it]," buried him; and the apostles gathered to Jesus and "brought word" to Him of all that they had done and taught. Matthew's use of "*bring word*" accords better than Mark's with the usage of N.T. and of Greek in general. The Greek verb "*bring word*," literally, "*bring-message-from*," implies etymologically, and for the most part practically, bringing word from a certain person or place about what the bringers have heard (as a message) from that person, or have seen or heard at that place. It does not often mean simply describe what the describers have themselves done. In that sense, "*declare*" or "*relate*" would be a better word than "*bring word*." Luke, who follows Mark in inserting a coming of "the apostles" to Jesus, says that they "*declared*" to Him "all that they had done¹."

The text of Mark is liable to suspicion. We do not know whether this is the first or the second instance in which he uses the word "apostles²." If it is the first, it comes here with

Mk vi. 29—34 (R.V.) <i>confid.</i>	Mt. xiv. 12—14 (R.V.) <i>confid.</i>	Lk. ix. 10—11 (R.V.)
because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and he began to teach them many things.	tressed and scattered, as sheep not having a shepherd.	

Jn vi. 1—5 a (R.V.). (1) After these things Jesus went away to the other side of the sea of Galilee, which is [the sea] of Tiberias. (2) And a great multitude followed him, because they beheld the signs which he did on them that were sick. (3) And Jesus went up into the mountain, and there he sat with his disciples. (4) Now the passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand. (5) Jesus therefore lifting up his eyes, and seeing that a great multitude cometh unto him,...

¹ Mk vi. 30 (and Mt. xiv. 12) "brought word (*ἀπήγγειλαν*)," Lk. ix. 10 "declared (*διηγήσαντο*)."
Luke omits "all that they had taught."

² See *Proclamation* p. 394 on Mk iii. 14 (R.V. marg. "some anc. auth. add *whom also he named apostles*").

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

extreme abruptness; and, even if it is the second and refers to those mentioned by Mark above, "whom also he [*i.e.* Jesus] named apostles," we should expect Mark to say, not that "they gather themselves together" to Jesus, but that "they returned" —which Luke actually says¹. In his parallel to Mark's expression "and *when* his disciples *heard thereof*," Matthew omits the "hearing²," which Mark may have added (as LXX often adds it) to imply "consequently³." But Matthew also omits all mention of the "apostles." This seems best explained from an original and ambiguous "they." This Matthew may have taken as meaning *the persons last mentioned*, namely, the disciples of the Baptist, but Mark as *the persons last mentioned before the digression concerning the death of the Baptist*, namely, the Twelve Apostles. Luke's omission of the Marcan phrase "whatsoever things they had taught" can be best explained by supposing it to be a Marcan amplification for clearness, the original being simply "they brought word of *everything*." This, if "they" were the disciples of the Baptist, would mean "they brought word of the whole story of the Baptist's death⁴." But Mark took it

¹ Mk vi. 30 *συνάγονται*, Lk. ix. 10 *ὑποστρέψαντες*. *Συνάγω*, which occurs five times in Mark, is used thrice of multitudes, and once (Mk vii. 1) of Pharisees and scribes, "gathering together" to Jesus. It is not the word we should expect for the return of so small a number as twelve persons, unless it was intended to suggest that they had been sent in different directions (comp. Lk. ix. 6 "everywhere").

² Mk vi. 29 *καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἦλθαν καὶ ἤραν...*, Mt. xiv. 12 *καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤραν...* Matthew applies "hearing" to Jesus in the next verse, Mt. xiv. 13 *ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς*. See next note.

³ Comp. Josh. ix. 11, 2 K. ix. 13, Esth. iv. 4, Job i. 20 (A), where Heb. has "and [consequently]," and LXX (or v.r.) inserts *ἀκούσας*.

⁴ SS has "they declared to him all that *he did* and *he taught*." Prof. Burkitt says that this is "probably a mere error" of SS, the pronunciation for this being the same as that for "they did and taught." If the scribe of SS attached any meaning to the text it would seem to be this, "the disciples of John recounted to Jesus

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

as referring to the Twelve. The notion that the Apostles at this critical and busy moment found leisure to bring word to Jesus about "*whatsoever things they had taught,*" as well as "*whatsoever things they had done,*" is antecedently improbable—at least in this hyperbolic form—and the rejection of it by Luke increases the improbability.

Since these details refer mainly to the Baptist, we cannot expect the Fourth Gospel to intervene although Luke deviates from, or omits, what is in Mark¹.

§ 4. "*And he saith unto them, Come ye...and rest a little,*"
in Mark²

Matthew and Luke omit these words. But, whereas Luke nowhere has any words of Jesus resembling them, Matthew has an invitation at least so far resembling Mark's that it contains similar words for "come" and "rest": "*Come unto me...and I will give-you-rest...ye shall find rest for your souls*³." The context in Matthew is a paradox, namely, that by taking on oneself a new "yoke," one may find "rest" from a heavy "burden." Ben Sira writes to the same effect about "discipline" or "instruction," saying "Incline thy shoulder and carry her, and loathe not her cords... for afterward thou shalt find her *rest*⁴." A different aspect of "*rest,*" namely, rest from wanderings, is presented by Jeremiah, "Ask for the

all their Master's last actions and utterances," including those mentioned in Mk vi. 20.

¹ See *Beginning* pp. 66, 68—71, "Non-intervention in matters affecting John the Baptist."

² Mk vi. 31 Δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον καὶ ἀναπαύσασθε ὄλιγον. SS has here "Come, let us go to the wilderness...", but in vi. 32, "they went to a desert place." The "desert place" will be discussed in a later section, p. 223 foll.

³ Mt. xi. 28—9 Δεῦτε πρὸς με πάντες...καὶ ἐγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς...εὐρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν. The words δεῦτε and ἀναπαύω are common to Mark and Matthew.

⁴ Sir. vi. 28 (ed. Schechter and Taylor), "rest," ἀνάπαυσιν, פִּנּוּן.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

old paths... and walk therein, and ye shall find *rest*, i.e. *repose*, for your souls¹." Again another aspect is presented where Isaiah says "This is the *rest*, give ye *rest* to him that is weary." There "weary" corresponds to a Hebrew word meaning faintness caused by hunger, or by thirst, or by wandering, and the LXX has "this is the rest for *him that is hungry*."² The Greek words used by Mark and Matthew for "rest" may also mean "refresh" in general, and "refresh with food" in particular. But in the latter sense, "with food" would have to be inserted. Mark does not insert it, and therefore we have no right to assume that he means "refresh yourselves a little [with food]." That interpretation however—besides being suggested by Mark's following words, "for those that were coming and those that were going were many, and *they* (i.e. *the disciples*) *had no leisure so much as to eat*"—appears to be favoured by Origen, who, after quoting Mark and Luke (about the "rows" or "companies" of the Five Thousand), speaks of "*those who were about to refresh-themselves on the nourishment of Jesus*."³

If Mark and Matthew took different views of the "rest," or "refreshment," to which Jesus invited His disciples, we can understand why Luke omitted the invitation. Mark places it immediately after the return of the Apostles from their mission; Matthew places it not long after Jesus had "made an end of

¹ Jerem. vi. 16, מנוח, LXX ἀνιτισμόν, Aq. [ἀνάψυξιν], Sym. ἡρεμίαν.

² Is. xxviii. 12 τοῦτο τὸ ἀνάπαυμα τῷ πεινῶντι. The word rendered πεινῶν, ἡγν=διδῶ (5), πεινάω (4), ἐκλύω (3)—for which comp. Mk viii. 3, Mt. xv. 32 in the Feeding of the Four Thousand.

³ Origen *Comm. Matth.* xi. 3 (Lomm. iii. 73) τοὺς ἀναπαυσομένους ἐπὶ ταῖς Ἰησοῦ τροφαῖς. I have not found such an instance in Steph. *Thes.*, nor one parall. to Mt. xi. 28 ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς, but there "from your burdens" may be supplied from what precedes. In Aesch. *fragm.* 178, ἀναπαύει, with καματὸν ἱππων, prob. does not mean (as L.S.) "refresh," but (as Steph. *Thes.*) "pausare," "make to cease."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

commanding his twelve disciples¹." Luke in a quasi-parallel passage mentions the return of the Seventy to Jesus with a report about their mission; but he appends no invitation—only a promise, such as the Mark-Appendix places after Christ's resurrection². Later on, in his Gospel, Luke represents Jesus as eating *in the presence* of His disciples, and later still, in the Acts—according to an ancient interpretation of a very difficult passage—as "*eating with them*"; but even there, no invitation on the part of Jesus to the disciples is mentioned in the context³.

¹ Mt. xi. 1. Mt. xi. 2—24 contains digressions about John the Baptist, Chorazin and Bethsaida. Then *ib.* 25—7 contains an acknowledgment of the Father's purpose to reveal His mysteries to "babes." Then follows (xi. 28—30) the promise of "rest" to the weary.

² Luke, after the woe pronounced (x. 13 foll.) on Chorazin and Bethsaida, and the return of the Seventy, represents Jesus as saying (x. 19) "I have given you authority...and nothing shall in any wise hurt you" (comp. Mk [xvi. 18] a promise made after Christ's resurrection).

³ Acts i. 4 συναλίζμενος, R.V. and A.V. txt "being assembled together with them," marg. "eating (A.V. + together) with them." See *Notes* 2892—5, to which should be added references to the "covenant of salt" in Numb. xviii. 19 (comp. Lev. ii. 13) and to the prominence given by Philo (ii. 477, 483—4) to "*salt* (*ἅλς*)" in his description of the meals taken by the Essenes in common. Aquila used the word συναλίζομαι to mean "take a friendly meal with" in Ps. cxli. 4 "let me not *eat* of their dainties." There LXX has συνδαΐζω, *i.e.* "make one out of two," "be in close companionship" (comp. 1 S. xxvi. 19 "cleave to," Sym. συνδαΐσθαι). Aquila's instance does not conclusively shew whether he regarded συναλίζομαι as derived (1) from ἀλίζω "collect [a crowd into a small space]" or (2) from ἀλίζομαι "be salted," *i.e.* "fed on salt"—salt being, both for Greeks and for Jews, the symbol of close, friendly, and festive intercourse (Steph. *Thes.* i. 1580 ἅλς "convictus et communio et sodalitatis necessitudo"). Against (1), there is the fact that ἀλίζω appears to be never used with a personal object in the singular, but always of a crowd, army, etc. This important word will come before us again when we discuss the Marcan (ix. 49) doctrine of being "salted with fire" (which Matthew and Luke omit).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

This passage in the Acts brings before us, as a possibility worth considering, the hypothesis that Mark, among a number of detached traditions about Eucharistic feeding which he has included in his narrative of the Five Thousand, may have antedated a tradition (about Jesus as inviting His disciples to a sacred meal) which may have been placed after the Resurrection by other Evangelists, and, in particular, by John. In any case, since "Come and rest" is a saying of Jesus mentioned by Mark and omitted by Luke, we are bound to look for something like it in John. And something like it—much more like it than appears at first sight—occurs in the Johannine account of the post-resurrectional feeding of the seven disciples on the one loaf, where Jesus is represented in our Revised Version as saying to the disciples, "Come, break your fast¹."

Instead of "break your fast," some such phrase as "take-your-morning-meal" would have been a better rendering of the verb *aristân*. It is nowhere used in N.T. except (twice) in this Johannine passage, and in one passage of Luke, where a Pharisee invites Jesus to a morning meal². There, the texts of our English Versions render it "dine." But the Greek word never means "dine." It is constantly distinguished from "dine," and contrasted with "dine³."

Returning to John, and rendering the invitation literally,

¹ Jn xxi. 12 δεῦτε, ἀριστήσατε. On δεῦτε, "Come!" never used by Luke, but used by Mk-Mt. in the "invitation" now under consideration (and elsewhere), see *Proclam.* pp. 48—9.

² Lk. xi. 37 ἀριστήσῃ. R.V. text "dine," marg. "*Gr.* breakfast." The context speaks of the washing of hands. Possibly, among the common people, though not among the Pharisees, the rule was not so strictly observed before "breakfast" as before the later meal.

³ See Steph. *Thes.* It can no more mean "dine" than our "breakfasted" could mean "dined." Luke uses the words "*dine*" and "*dinner*" (δειπνεῖν, δείπνον) about six or seven times, and the verb "to breakfast" only here. In one passage (xiv. 12) "a breakfast or a dinner," he distinguishes the two.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"[Come] *hither! Take-your-morning-meal!*" we perceive that it accords not only with the literal time—the dawn that brought success to the fishermen after the laborious night of failure—but also with the metaphorical or spiritual time, the dawn that was to bring success to the apostolic fishermen casting the net of the Gospel. The meal was their "morning-meal" preparing them to carry forth the Gospel to the world¹. It appears to correspond both literally and spiritually to the Marcan tradition "Come ye...and rest," omitted by Luke, of which perhaps a version is given by Matthew. As in Mark, so in John, the invitation precedes a meal on bread and fish; but, as in Matthew, the "rest" or "refreshment" is not of the body but of the spirit. Matthew expresses it by "Take my yoke upon you" and "Learn from me"; John expresses it by the words addressed to Peter, and through Peter to the whole assembly of Christians, commanding each in his appointed way to carry the cross, and to serve Christ by serving those for whom Christ died: "Feed my sheep," and "Follow thou me²."

§ 5. "*Come ye, [by] yourselves, apart, into a desert place,*"
in Mark³

The words "into a desert place" appear to imply, not a desert place meaning a dry and barren waste, but simply "a lonely, quiet, or retired, place." But they are omitted (with the rest of the sentence) by Matthew and Luke, perhaps as being liable to misunderstanding. The words "by yourselves" and "apart" go some way to make the meaning clear, but not quite far enough. The meaning seems to be that in

¹ In canonical LXX, ἀποστῆναι occurs only twice as representing Hebrew correctly, (a) Gen. xliii. 25 Heb. "eat bread," (b) 1 K. xiii. 7 Heb. "support [thyself with food]," R.V. and A.V. "refresh thyself," Heb. נָסַח and sim. in Targum. The Clementine Heb. rendering of Jn xxi. 12 ἀποστῆσαι is נָסַח.

² Mt. xi. 28—9, Jn xxi. 15—22.

³ Mk vi. 31.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the general excitement and consternation consequent on the murder of John the Baptist, Jesus perceived that it would be good for the disciples to be alone with Him for a while. To be alone with Him would not be to be really "alone," or "desolate," or "abandoned in a wilderness." Being with the Son, they would be with the Father. Epictetus has a discourse entitled "What is *desertedness* (or, a *desert* (erēmia)) and what kind of person is *deserted* (erēmos)?" It begins thus: "*Deserted[ness]* is a kind of unbefriended state. For he that is *alone* is not necessarily *deserted*, as also he that is in a crowd is not necessarily *undeserted*¹."

That John recognised this truth is shewn later on when he represents Jesus as saying "Ye shall leave me alone; and [yet] I am not alone, because the Father is with me²." He could not indeed represent Jesus as saying to the seven disciples for whom He has prepared the fish and the loaf "Come ye, by yourselves, apart, into a quiet place"—for they were in a quiet place already. But he does succeed in giving us the impression that, before the Feeding of the Five Thousand, Jesus had invited the disciples to accompany Him away from the multitude into a place of quiet. In the description of the man seeking the one sheep that has strayed, where Matthew has "*the mountains*," Luke has "*the desert*." So here, John does not call the place of retirement "*a desert place*" but "*the mountain*," thus: "And a great multitude followed him... and Jesus went up into *the mountain*, and there he sat with his disciples³."

In this way John, in effect, reproduces the Marcan "desert place," but without the notion of desertedness. By "sat with

¹ Epict. iii. 13. 1.

² Jn xvi. 32.

³ Jn vi. 2—3, comp. Mt. xviii. 12 "*the mountains*," Lk. xv. 4 "*the desert*." The "loneliness" of "*the mountain*" comes before us afterwards (Jn vi. 15) "Jesus withdrew again into the mountain *himself alone*."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

his disciples" he implies that Jesus was not only with them but also was with them in quiet converse. As regards the term "desert place" or "wilderness" used by all the Synoptists in their narratives of feeding¹, it is noteworthy that John does not use any form of it in the narrative itself. But afterwards, in the subsequent comment of the Jews, and in Christ's reply, he twice has "ate the manna *in the wilderness*," that is, *in the wilderness of Sinai*. The Jews seem to say this with unmixed satisfaction, "*our fathers ate*." Jesus adds a note of warning, "*your fathers ate...and died*."

Before passing from the words of Jesus ("come ye...into a *desert place*") we must note that the Syriac Versions have, not "*a desert place*," but "*the wilderness*," *midbar*². This has quite a different meaning. *Midbar* might be applied to a wilderness or open country near any town or district, named in the context; but where no such place is named it always means (in the Bible) the wilderness of Sinai, as, for example, where the Lord bids Moses say to Pharaoh "Let us go...three days' journey into *the wilderness* that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God³." Among the reasons why Matthew and Luke omit these words, one may have been a doubt whether they were correctly used. In early poetic accounts of Christ's miracles of feeding, the language of Scripture about the manna in the *Midbar* of Sinai might be applied to the Christian "table in the wilderness" in expressions sometimes not strictly correct if taken literally. These might naturally be rejected by later Evangelists.

¹ Mk vi. 35, Mt. xiv. 15 (sim. Lk. ix. 12) ἄρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος, Mk viii. 4, Mt. xv. 33 ἔρημος.

² Jn vi. 31, 49.

³ Mk vi. 31 (SS) "let us go into *the wilderness* (*midbar*)," but vi. 32 "they went to a *desert place*" and vi. 35 "the *place* is *desert*."

⁴ Exod. iii. 18, rep. viii. 27. It is worth noting here that a mention of "three days" (which will be discussed later on, p. 263 foll.) occurs at the beginning of the Feeding of the Four Thousand.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 6. The concourse of "many," in Mark

Mark four times uses the word "many" here, thrice in connection with the concourse of "many" or "the great [lit. *much*] multitude," and once about the "many [things]" that Jesus began to teach them¹. There are several variations in the MSS and Versions. A specimen of these is given below from the Syro-Sinaitic², which avoids one or two difficult questions raised by the received text.

It is not difficult perhaps to realise that the disciples might feel not only overcrowded by people continually coming to Jesus, but also harassed by people continually going away. But it is difficult to believe that the multitude, which (according to Matthew) included women and children, "outwent" the boat that contained Jesus—the multitude going round the lake, a distance of about ten miles, and the boat going across the lake, a distance of about four³.

¹ Mk vi. 31—4 "For those that were coming and those that were going (ὑπάγοντες) were *many*,...and *many* saw (εἶδαν) them (αὐτοὺς) going (ὑπάγοντας) and recognised (ἔγνωσαν, marg. ἐπίγνωσαν) [them] (or, and they [*i.e.* people] saw them going, and *many* recognised [them]); and on foot from all the cities they ran-together there and outwent them (συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς). And having come forth [from the boat] he saw a *great* (πολὺν) multitude...and he began to teach them *many* [things] (πολλά)."

² Mk vi. 31 foll. (SS) "Many were going and coming unto him... and many saw them and recognised them and went by land after him from all the cities. And when they came and he saw a great multitude...and he had begun to teach them." SS alters "those coming and those going" into "going and coming unto him," thus emphasizing the arrivals rather than the departures, or perhaps using "going and" pleonastically (as it is often used in English); it substitutes "went after him" for "ran-together"; it omits "outwent them"; it substitutes "they came and he saw" for "he came forth [from the vessel] and saw."

This important version had not been discovered when W.H. discussed the variations of Mk vi. 33 in W.H. Intr. p. 95 foll.

³ Prof. Swete says *ad loc.* "Across the Lake from Tell Hum or Khan Minyeh is scarcely more than four miles; by land the distance

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Luke seems to imply, by omitting all these Marcan details, that they seemed to him either unimportant, or difficult, or both, and that the one important fact was that "the multitudes followed" Jesus—how "they followed" being a matter of detail that might be neglected. Perhaps Luke, in this respect, is imitating Matthew, who also accepts "the multitudes followed" as a convenient summary of Mark's diffuse statements¹. But Luke deviates from Matthew as well as from Mark by omitting the words "And, having gone forth [from the boat] he saw a great multitude²." They do not seem very important, and, even if John had nothing whatever corresponding to them, though we should have to confess that the law of Johannine Intervention failed here, it would not seem a very serious failure. But John has in the context something that appears to correspond to them, only modified by a suggestion of symbolism, as follows: "After these things Jesus went away beyond the sea of Galilee [the sea] of Tiberias. Now a great multitude was following him, because they were [constantly] seeing the signs that he was doing on the sick. But Jesus went up to the mountain, and there sat with his disciples. Now the passover was near—the feast of the Jews

to the upper part of Batthah could hardly be above ten (Sanday, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 120) unless they went by road and crossed the Jordan by the bridge." He adds "If there was little wind, it would be easy to get to the place before a sailing boat." But if there was so "little wind" that they could not cover "more than four miles" while a crowd including women and children covered "ten," would they not have at once used their oars, which Mark (vi. 48) and John (vi. 19) describe them as using on their return?

¹ Mt. xiv. 13 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ, Lk. ix. 11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι γινόντες ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. Mark does not use ἀκολουθίω here. His view is that the multitude went round the lake before Jesus so as to meet Him when He landed—which would not naturally be described as "following."

² Mk vi. 34, Mt. xiv. 14 (identical in order as well as in words) καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολλὸν ὄχλον.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

[so called]. Jesus therefore, *lifting up his eyes and beholding that a great multitude was coming to him*, saith unto Philip...¹."

It will be noted that here, while first accepting the Matthew-Luke prosaic summarizing word, "*followed*," John adds a form of the Mark-Matthew tradition that Jesus "*beheld*" this "*great multitude*." That this is symbolical is indicated by the contextual "*lifting up of the eyes*"—an act thrice attributed to Jesus by John and always as a symbol². It is also attributed thrice in Scripture to Abraham. The first Abrahamic instance is where the Patriarch "*lifted up his eyes*" and beheld the three divine Persons to whom he ministered and gave bread; the second is where he saw the mountain on which he was to offer up his son; the third is where he saw the ram that was to be Isaac's substitute³. It is a commonplace in Jewish tradition that whatever Abraham did in service to God, God has done, or will do, in return, to Abraham's seed. It would therefore be appropriate that before the Feeding of the Five Thousand, who represented the congregation of Israel, the Son of God should "*go up into the mountain*" and "*lift up his eyes*," and "*behold that a great multitude was coming unto him*."

¹ Jn vi. 1—5. This implies that Jesus was on the spot and receiving the multitude (as Lk. ix. 11 "he welcomed them"), not that the multitude was on the spot awaiting Jesus whom they "outwent" (as Mk vi. 33). In Mk vi. 33 προήλθον αὐτοὺς, "they outwent them," "*they*" may mean (1) Jesus and the disciples, or (2) the multitude (and "*them*" is similarly ambiguous). The former meaning of "*they*" is the more consistent with the circumstances; taking the short cut across the lake, Jesus and the disciples easily "outwent" the multitude. Then, some hours afterwards, Jesus received and welcomed those who persistently followed Him. Mark's use of προέρχουσι with accus. is noteworthy (see Steph. Thes.). In Lk. xxii. 47 it is used of Judas "*going before*" the soldiers as their guide.

² See Joh. Voc. 1608 (quoting Philo) and Joh. Gr. 2616—7 on Jn vi. 3—5. The other instances are xi. 41 (at the tomb of Lazarus), xvii. 1 (before "Father, the hour hath come"). Once Jesus uses the phrase as a precept, iv. 35 "Lift up your eyes," i.e. to the harvest in the heavens.

³ Gen. xviii. 2, xxii. 4, 13.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Whatever may have been the historical reality, the Evangelist contemplates it as including a vision. The Son, the Sacrifice, the Bread of Life, who in old days came to Abraham and received Abraham's bread, now "beholds" the children of Abraham coming to Him in need of bread. Visibly, they are five thousand Jews from northern Palestine; but invisibly they are the seed of Abraham as a whole, invited to enter the circle of that large family of nations which was to be blessed with the blessing pronounced on Abraham. As Abraham gave bread to the Son, so the Son gives bread to Abraham's children. And as Abraham offered up Isaac to God, so the Son of God, in the sign of the bread that followed, signified that He Himself was purposing to offer Himself up for Abraham's children in accordance with the will of the Father in heaven.

If this instance stood alone, the hypothesis of Johannine Intervention here would not be a very probable one; but when taken with many other instances of which some few are certain and many others are highly probable, it acquires considerable probability. And this is greatly increased by the drift of Jewish traditions concerning Abraham and his relation to the Messiah. In a Gospel that assigns to Jesus the words "Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad¹," it is obvious that we must expect to find thoughts about Abraham latent under many of the acts and utterances of Him to whom these words are assigned. We may safely assert that the actual words are John's, not Christ's, but we shall not be so safe in making such an assertion about the thoughts.

This proof of intervention is quite irrespective of the correctness of the Marcan or the Johannine tradition. Even if Mark is quite wrong, it will still be true that John, believing Mark to be right in a certain sense, has intervened to shew that sense. What that "sense" might naturally be will be perceived from such a prophecy as that of Amos, "I will send a

¹ Jn viii. 56. See *Joh. Gr.* 2097, 2688—9.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst of water, but of hearing the words of the Lord; and they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east; they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord¹." Jesus Himself seems to allude to this prophecy in the words "Many shall come from the east and the west"—where Luke adds "and from the north and the south"—"and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven²." Also a prophecy of Daniel, interpreted by Irenaeus as referring to Christ, says "Many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased³." This, when combined with the prophecy of Amos, might originate just such traditions as Mark has thrown together about the concourse of "many" to Christ's teaching, and to the banquet that He provided for those who suffered from a "famine" for "hearing the words of the Lord." The hypothesis of such an origin would give a satisfactory explanation of Mark's diffuse traditions and Luke's omissions. "Mark,"

¹ Amos viii. 11—12.

² Mt. viii. 11, Lk. xiii. 29. The occasions on which these parallel sayings were uttered are quite different. Origen, quoting the Gospels, has (*Comm. Rom.* ii. 14, *Lomm.* vi. 148) "*ab oriente et occidente et a quatuor ventis terras.*" Does this mean "and [indeed, not only from east and west, but also, as Luke says] from the four winds of the world"? The Targum on Amos viii. 12 has "from the sea to the west (מִיָּם וְעַד מִזְמֹרֶת) and from the north to the east." *Sabbath* p. 138 b (ed. Goldschmidt) quotes Amos "From sea to sea from east (מִמִּזְמֹרֶת) and from west (מִיָּם וְעַד מִזְמֹרֶת)" with no note. On Zech. ix. 10 "from sea to sea," the Targ. says "from the sea even to the west," but Kimchi "from the South Sea which is called Red, to the North Sea which is called Ocean." These variations may have influenced Christian traditions about the concourse to Jesus. Some might take "from sea to sea" as "from the sea of Galilee to the Mediterranean," i.e. the parts about Tyre and Sidon. Luke would not interpret "sea" as referring to the sea of Galilee since he always calls it "lake."

³ Dan. xii. 4 LXX *ἵνα ἀνὰ ποταμῶσιν οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ πλησθῇ ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας*. But Theod. *ἵνα διδάχθῶσιν πολλοὶ καὶ πληθυνθῇ ἡ γνώσις* (תַּעֲרִיב) (see *Clus* 7, 90—1), and so Iren. iv. 26. 1 "quoadusque discant multi et adimpleatur agnitio."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

we may say, "recorded a historical fact (that is, the Concourse) in the language of poetry based on prophecy—not knowing the nature either of the language or of its basis—and left the old traditions just as they were without making them fit together; Luke omitted them; John penetrated to the old poetical purpose underlying Mark and expressed it in a new symbolism."

In a comment on Mark's narrative of the first concourse to Jesus attention was drawn to the apparent allusiveness of the Marcan "great number," as pointing to expressions in Genesis concerning the seed of Abraham¹. But in that Marcan narrative we may trace also the influence of Amos (variously interpreted) in suggesting the regions of the world from which believers were to draw near to the Messiah². The same influences may be traced in Mark's narrative of a second concourse. The Hebrew use of the somewhat rare verb "*run-to-and-fro*," applied to those hungering and thirsting after truth by Amos, and to "*many*" by Daniel³, may very well explain Mark's perplexing accumulation of verbs of motion, commented on above—"coming and going," "*running together*," and "*outstripping*"—all omitted by Matthew and Luke.

This recognition of Mark's allusiveness, in connection with a prophecy about "*many*," will come before us again when we consider such Marcan words of Jesus as "to give his life a ransom for *many*," and, "this is my blood which... is shed for *many*." Both of these sayings appear to be based on words of Isaiah: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify

¹ *Proclamation* p. 376, quoting Mk iii. 7—8 πολλὸν πλῆθος...πλῆθος πολὺ.

² Amos viii. 12, mentioning the "north," may explain why Mark (*Proclamation* p. 375) followed by Matthew, inserts "Galilee," as representing the "north" (besides being the "Galilee of the Gentiles" mentioned by Isaiah). Luke vi. 17 omits "Galilee."

³ Amos viii. 12, Dan. xii. 4 "*run-to-and-fro*" (Gesen. 1001—2).

⁴ Mk x. 45, xiv. 24 parall. to Mt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28, omitted in parall. Lk. xxii. 27 and *ib.* 20 (see W.H.).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

many...he bare the sin of *many*¹." Both are adopted by the parallel Matthew but omitted by the parallel Luke.

Are we to infer that in both these passages Mark has been induced by the influence of prophecy to attribute to Jesus sayings that He did not really utter, which Luke has consequently omitted? Without anticipating the discussion of these Marcan traditions in their order, we may note here, as to the first of them, that the parallel Luke introduces, as words of Jesus, "he that sitteth at meat" and "he that serveth," and represents Jesus as saying "I am among you as he that serveth²." Now John represents Jesus as actually "serving" while the disciples sit at meat—and serving in such a way as to suggest a picture of the Saviour of the world wiping off the stains of sinful men upon Himself³. This points to a Johannine intervention between Mark and Luke, as if John said: "It is true that Mark has added, to the actual words that Jesus uttered, words that He did not utter. But he added

¹ Is. liii. 11—12. Of רבים, freq. = "*many* [*men*]," Gesen. 913 *a* gives, as the first instance, Exod. xxiii. 2 (*bis*) "Thou shalt not follow *a multitude* (so R.V. and A.V.) to do evil, neither shalt thou speak in a cause to turn aside after *a multitude* (A.V. *many*) to wrest [judgment]." LXX οὐκ ἔσθι μετὰ πλειόνων ἐν κακίᾳ· οὐ προσθήσθι μετὰ πλήθους ἐκκλίνειν μετὰ πλειόνων ὥστε ἐκκληῖσαι κρίσιν. On this, Rashi says "Sunt hujus textus expositiones sapientum Israël, sed sermo Scripturae eis non convenit..." But it does not appear to be disputed that the Heb. "*many*," in a suitable context, may mean "*the many*," or "*the majority*."

² Lk. xxii. 27 τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονῶν;...ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμὶ ὡς ὁ διακονῶν.

³ Jn xiii. 4 foll. See Notes 2963—4 shewing that Origen (on Jn xiii. 5) quotes Luke xxii. 27 with a reminiscence of Mk x. 45 "He who said 'I came not as the guest but as the attendant'...He Himself puts water in the basin." Origen also (Lomm. ii. 401) connects the Saviour's "wiping off" on Himself the filth from the feet of the disciples with Is. liii. 4 (comp. Mt. viii. 17) "He beareth our infirmities." See Son 3276 *a* where the belief is expressed that this representation was not a dramatic fiction, but was based on tradition.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

them to explain what Jesus *meant* by 'ministering': Luke, rejecting those additional words, has left the saying of Jesus in such a context as to lead his readers into a misunderstanding of His 'ministering.' It was not waiting at table, handing this dish or that. It might rather be described as a washing of the feet before the repast. And indeed the Saviour did this kind of service for His disciples, wiping off on Himself the defilements that could not but from time to time befall them in the course of their pilgrimage through the impurities of this present world¹."

§ 7. "*They had no leisure so much as to eat,*" in Mark²

It is of course possible that this Marcan tradition meant, from the first, nothing more than this, that the disciples had literally "no leisure" to eat enough for their simple wants; that Mark inserted it in this sense; and that Matthew and Luke omitted it—influenced perhaps in part by the fact that Jesus seemed to have summoned them at an early hour of the morning³, before the time had come for a regular meal—because they thought it hyperbolical. Or Matthew and Luke may have omitted it as being unimportant from a spiritual point of view.

¹ On Gen. xviii. 4 "let a little water be fetched and wash your feet," Rashi says that as the water is fetched by Abraham's "servant" "per aliquem qui mittitur," i.e. *Sheliach*, or *Apostle* (*Proclamation* pp. 391, 395), so God recompenses Abraham's children by a messenger ("legatum"), namely, Moses. But Gen. v. ad loc. sees a divine recompense of water proceeding not only from Moses (Numb. xxi. 17) who gives water to drink, but also from God (Is. iv. 4, Ezek. xvi. 9) who Himself purifies Israel with water (sim. more fully in Numb. v., on Numb. vii. 48, Wü. pp. 348—9).

² Mk vi. 31 οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν, D ουδε φαγεῖν ευκαιρος (i.e. *εὐκαίρως*) εἶπον, a "nec cibum poterant capere," SS (lit.) "and there was not for them place even bread to eat."

³ Mk vi. 30—35 shews that a great deal took place between the summons of Jesus and the advent of evening, so that the summons must have been early.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

But there are so many instances where Mark's apparently unimportant little phrases about certain subjects, and particularly about the Doctrine of Bread, are much more important than they seem, that this phrase invites investigation. Its insertion in an early Gospel would become intelligible if it originally described the disciples as being unable to "eat their bread" at a common meal with such "gladness and singleness of heart"¹ as characterized the meals taken by them in company with Jesus. Such meals would partake of the nature of a religious service. The omission of the phrase by Matthew and Luke would, by itself, oblige us to discuss it; and the fact that it refers to bread (not indeed here mentioned but certainly implied by the word "eat") makes the discussion all the more necessary.

The Marcan verb "*have-leisure*," literally "*have-good-season*," occurs nowhere else in the Gospels nor in LXX. Codex D substitutes a phrase with a corresponding adverb meaning "*in-good-season*." This adverb occurs in Ben Sira "Be not thou hindered from paying a vow *in-good-season*²"; and the corresponding adjective occurs in the Psalms "These wait upon thee that thou mayest give them their meat *in-due-season*³." These passages vaguely suggest that in the beginnings of the Christian Church forms of the word might be associated by some with the Eucharist, or with Christ's "breaking of bread" before the Eucharist was formally instituted. But the verb, though proscribed by the Grammarians as a barbarous equivalent of the legitimate phrase "*have leisure*⁴," is used by Luke (in the

¹ Acts ii. 46 "breaking bread at home they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart."

² Sir. xviii. 22 *μη ἐμποδισθῆς τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι εὐχὴν εὐκαίρως*. It occurs nowhere else in LXX.

³ Ps. civ. 27 *τὴν τροφὴν αὐτοῖς εὐκαιρον* (v. γ. *eis καιρον, εν ευκαιρια, eis ευκαιρον*). This is the only instance in canon. LXX, but in 2 and 3 Macc. *ευκαιρος* occurs five times.

⁴ "Have leisure," *σχολὴν ἄγω*, or *σχολάζω*. See Steph. *Thes.*

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Acts) concerning the Athenians: "Now all the Athenians and the strangers sojourning there (lit.) *were-wont-to-have-good-season* for nothing else except to say or hear something of more than usual novelty¹." Luke obviously means, by his use of the imperfect tense in such a context, not that the Athenians really *had* no leisure, but that they *would habitually make* no leisure. They habitually said "*We have no leisure* for this or that." But if they had spoken the truth they would have said "We are not disposed to do this or that²." Mark, like Luke, uses the verb in the imperfect tense. Is it not possible, then, that Luke rejected the word here in his Gospel because it seemed to him to suggest that the disciples were like the Athenians, restlessly refusing to "*find leisure*" for something for which they ought to have "*found leisure*"?

This supposition Luke might deem incredible. But the Fourth Gospel indicates that there was a spirit of restlessness among the Five Thousand, which extended to the disciples, including ultimately almost all but the Twelve; and if we consider these indications along with the recent execution of John the Baptist by Herod, we shall perceive that there may be nothing absurd in the supposition that the Twelve themselves were restless and unsettled and not disposed to "*find leisure*" for "*eating bread*" in the presence of their Master with the "*gladness and singleness of heart*" to which He was gradually accustoming them³.

and (preferably) Wetstein on Mk vi. 31, quoting *Etymol.*, *Moeris*, *Thomas*, and *Phrynichus*.

¹ Acts xvii. 21 *εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἡδκαίρουν ἢ λέγειν τι ἢ ἀκούειν τι καινότερον*. It was not only to be "new" but "newer [than usual]." And their first object was to "say" something of this kind, their second, to "hear" it.

² Comp. Acts xxiv. 25, where Felix says—in answer to Paul's "reasoning" about "righteousness" and "the judgment to come"—"When I get a [suitable] season (*καιρὸν*) I will call thee unto me"; but he means "I am not disposed to listen to reasoning about 'righteousness,' I want money."

³ Acts ii. 46.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

The first intimation of this is in the exclamation of those who have fed on the loaves and fishes, "This is of a truth the prophet that cometh into the world," where it is added that Jesus perceived that they proposed "to take him by force to make him a king¹." Jesus reproaches them thus, "Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves²." They prefer "the meat that perisheth" to "the meat that abideth unto eternal life³." Jesus does not reproach the Twelve thus. But He implies that one of them (Judas Iscariot) deserved such a reproach ("one of you is a devil"); and to all of them He says "Will ye also depart⁴?" These would-be king-makers might be called—in the language of Matthew and Luke describing Christ's Temptation—instruments of the Tempter, tempting Jesus to pay Satan homage; and perhaps that thought underlies the Johannine saying "one of you is a devil."

If the disciples, amid the political excitement and course consequent on the death of John the Baptist, shewed some disposition to favour the views of the multitude, who wished to make their Master a king, that would explain not only Mark's brief and obscure mention of "want of leisure to eat," but also John's long and emphatic comment on the necessity of "eating," and on the impossibility of doing God's work without the sustenance of God's Bread, the "living" Bread, God's Word, God's Son.

Summing up the evidence as to the Marcan phrase about "leisure to eat," we find that the conclusion is doubtful as to its precise allusion and as to the reasons why Luke omits it. But there is a fair probability that it contains, or might be regarded in early times as containing, some allusion to the Hebrew thought of food as God's "seasonable" gift and to the expression of this by the LXX in the Psalmist's

¹ Jn vi. 14—15.

² Jn vi. 27.

³ Jn vi. 26.

⁴ Jn vi. 67—70.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

language about God as giving food to His creatures "in its season¹." Further, there is evidence enough to justify our accepting, as a working hypothesis, the supposition that under Mark's original there was latent an obscure Eucharistic meaning. This, if existent, is wholly lost by Matthew and Luke, who omit the Marcan phrase, but not by John, who attempts to elicit and to expound it².

§ 8. "*To a desert place apart,*" in Mark and Matthew

It will be observed below that instead of "to a desert place"—where we should rather expect a "solitary" or "retired" place—Luke has "*to a city called Bethsaida*³." Mark himself mentions Bethsaida later on, immediately after the Feeding of the Five Thousand and before the Walking on the Sea. There, however, he describes the disciples, not as coming back *from* Bethsaida (as we should have expected from Luke's account) but as coming *to* Bethsaida, and the parallel Matthew

¹ See Ps. civ. 27, cxlv. 15, and the comment (in *Gen. i.*, on *Gen. i. 3*, Wü. p. 11) on Prov. xv. 23 "a word *in its season*, how good it is!" where it is maintained that the "word" is "*Light*," which God uttered "in its season" when He said, "Let there be *Light*!" and He saw that the Light was "good." The Lord's Prayer, and the Sermon on the Mount, and the Temptation, all point to the conclusion that Jesus taught that the Father in heaven is the Giver of every good thing, and of each in "its season," which is also "His season." The Eucharist includes this lesson.

² Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 20 *συνερχομένων οὖν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν*. The various renderings of these words, and the interpretations of modern commentators, shew how other early Eucharistic traditions might be misunderstood.

³ Mk vi. 32	Mt. xiv. 13	Lk. ix. 10
And they went away in the boat to a desert place apart.	Now when Jesus heard it he withdrew (ἀνεχώρησεν) from thence in a boat to a desert place apart....	And he took them and retired (ἀπεχώρησεν) apart to a city called Bethsaida.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

omits "Bethsaida," while the parallel Luke omits both "Bethsaida" and the whole of the narrative that follows¹.

These facts indicate some early confusion about "Bethsaida." Instead of this name the Curetonian Syriac in Luke has "a desert place," while the Sinaitic Syrian has "to the gate of a city called Bethsaida²." Codex D has "village" instead of "city." The Latin and other versions mostly omit "city" and insert "desert place." One way of explaining not only these variations, but also Luke's inconsistency in "came to *Bethsaida*" and "we are here *in a desert place*," would be to suppose that Luke has mistaken *Beth Saidā*, a poetic phrase meaning House of Provisioning, for the "city" of that name. The same Psalm that represents Israel as exclaiming "Can God prepare a table in the wilderness³?" says "He rained

¹ Mk vi. 45

And straightway he constrained his disciples to enter into the boat, and to go before [him] unto the other side to *Bethsaida*....

Mt. xiv. 22

And straightway he constrained the disciples to enter into the [*or*, a] boat, and to go before him unto the other side....

Lk. ix. 18

And it came to pass, as he was praying alone (*καταμόνος*)

Lk. ix. 18, which follows Luke's Feeding of the Five Thousand, is printed here to shew Luke's divergence at this stage from Mark and Matthew.

Mk vi. 47, Mt. xiv. 23, and Jn vi. 15 agree with Luke ix. 18 in representing Jesus as "alone (*μόνος*)" after the Feeding of the Five Thousand, but they mention it in their preface to the Walking on the Waters, which Luke omits.

² In Lk. ix. 10 (Curet.) "and he *took* (*דבר*) them apart-by-themselves and went to a place [that was] desert," the verb "*took*" in the form *טָּבַח* (e.g. 1 S. xix. 14 (Targ. and Syr.) "to *take* (*טָּבַח*) David") might be regarded as meaning *טָּבַח* (*מִדְבָּר*), *midbar*, the regular word for "*wilderness*" in Hebrew and Aramaic. Walton's Syr. has "in locum desertum Bethsaidae," and *a*, *b*, *c* and *Brix.* all insert "locum desertum" without "*urbs*" or "*vicus*."

³ Ps. lxxviii. 19 Heb. "in the wilderness," but LXX, here and *ib.* 15, quite contrary to rule, has *ἐν ἐρήμῳ*, omitting the article. Contrast Exod. v. 1, vii. 16, viii. 20, 28 etc., and perhaps a hundred more instances, all *ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*. The Heb., when unpointed, might mean "the" or "a" wilderness. Israelites, when described in poetry as

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

down manna upon them to eat, and gave them of the corn of heaven... , he sent them *provision* to the full¹." Now the Hebrew for "*provision*" is there *Saida*. Poetically therefore it might be said that God in bringing Israel into the wilderness where He rained manna on them, brought them to "a house, or place, of provision," that is, "*Bethsaida*."

This view is confirmed from Greek sources. The Greek for "*provision*" is literally "*supplying with corn*," *episitismos*. This word applies exactly to the supply of manna. For manna was, as the same Psalm says, "*corn from heaven*," not "*bread*," but of the nature of "*corn*," since it had to be ground and seethed to make it eatable². *Episitismos* in LXX always corresponds to the Hebrew "*Saida*." It is used, in Genesis, of Joseph supplying "*provision*" from Egypt to his brethren, and, in Exodus, of the inability of Israel to supply themselves with "*provision*" for their journey into the wilderness³. The instance in Exodus would make the word peculiarly appropriate in the Psalm which represents God as making for Israel in the wilderness that "*provision*" which Israel could not make for themselves in Egypt. Similarly, we shall presently find Luke, alone among the Evangelists, representing the disciples as saying to Jesus, "Send away the multitude...that they may find *provision* (*episitismos*)⁴, because we are here in a desert

being new to the wilderness of Sinai, might speak of it as "a" wilderness, but afterwards as "the" wilderness.

¹ Ps. lxxviii. 25 "*provision*," צִידָה, ἐπισιτισμός (R.V. "*meat*").

² Ps. lxxviii. 24 "*corn* (רֶגֶן)." LXX renders this word elsewhere 37 times (Tromm.) by σίτος, but ἀπρος only here—a mistranslation. On the grinding and seething of the manna see Numb. xi. 8. The mistranslation ("*bread*") is repeated by unbelieving Jews in Jn vi. 31. Jesus implies in His answer that it was *not* (ib. 32) "*the true bread out of heaven*." It should be noted however that "*the bread of the mighty*" is mentioned in Ps. lxxviii. 25.

³ Gen. xlii. 25, xlv. 21, Exod. xii. 39, ἐπισιτισμός here and elsewhere (11 times in Heb. LXX and alw. = צִידָה, *Saida*).

⁴ Lk. ix. 12 ἐπισιτισμός (R.V. "*victuals*"). It does not occur elsewhere in N.T.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

place." The coincidence is not likely to be accidental, especially since *episitismos* does not occur anywhere else in N.T. It is reasonable to believe that there is an allusion to Exodus, and to the "provision" of manna in the wilderness.

According to this view, Luke is right in retaining this word *episitismos*, unique in N.T., but wrong in duplicating it as "Bethsaida," and in placing "Bethsaida" at the beginning of the narrative. It should have come at the end. The disciples say, in effect, as the representatives of Israel, "We are in the wilderness. We are unable to *make provision* for the people. Send them away that they may *make provision* for themselves." Jesus replies by "*making provision.*" Accordingly, after the gathering of the fragments, the conclusion of the narrative should have been: "Thus did the Lord lead His people that were in the wilderness into *a place of provision, i.e. into Bethsaida.*" As a fact, Mark places a mention of Bethsaida in that position, though not in suitable context¹. Matthew omits "Bethsaida," and it is very probable that it is an error of Mark. If so, it is similar, and yet dissimilar, to that of Luke. Mark, like Luke, has perhaps confused a poetic phrase with a proper name. But unlike Luke, Mark has placed the name at the end of the narrative, whereas Luke (less correctly) has placed it at the beginning.

The Johannine equivalents to "desert place" or "wilderness" in the Feeding of the Five Thousand have been touched on above. As to Bethsaida John cannot be expected to intervene. As a rule, he avoids Synoptic names, being the only Evangelist that does not use the name "Gennesaret," and that does use "Tiberias." Bethsaida he mentions only in connection with Philip, who is "from Bethsaida²."

¹ Mk vi. 45 "unto the other side *to Bethsaida*," Mt. xiv. 22 om. "*to Bethsaida.*"

² Jn i. 44, xii. 21. W.H. marg. has Bethsaida in Jn v. 2, but that is the name of a pool.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 9. "In the boat," in Mark¹

Mark, having previously told us that Jesus ordered that a boat should be constantly ready², now calls it naturally "*the boat*." Matthew, not having made this statement, calls it "*a boat*." Luke does not mention it here, and rather implies that Jesus quietly withdrew on foot, and that the multitudes followed Him on foot afterwards, when they became aware of His departure³. John suggests the same thing at the beginning of his narrative, and afterwards suggests it again, or indirectly affirms it, with curious detail. First he says that Jesus (R.V.) "*went away to the other side of* (A.V. *went over*) *the sea of Galilee*"⁴; then he says that, after the Feeding, when the disciples came down to the sea for the purpose of going to Capernaum, they "*entered into a boat*." He does not here say "*the boat*," which would have clearly meant the boat in which they had come. And yet afterwards he says that "the multitude saw...that there was *no other boat* there, *save* [*only there had been*] *one*, and that Jesus entered not with his disciples into *the boat*, but that his disciples had gone away alone—howbeit there came (*or*, had come) [*other*] *boats* from Tiberias...⁵." These

¹ Mk vi. 32.

² Mk iii. 9. See *Proclamation* p. 377 suggesting that in the early Galilaean Church there may have been sometimes a play on the two words—almost identical in Aramaic and Syriac—"boat" and "*teaching*."

³ Mt. xiv. 13.

⁴ Lk. ix. 10—11 *ὑπεχώρησεν...οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι γινόντες ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ*. One would not infer from these words that Jesus "withdrew" by sea and the multitudes "followed" by land.

⁵ Jn vi. 1 *ἀπῆλθεν πέραν*. Nonnus adds "in a ship (*ἐνὶ πολυκλήιδι ταμὲν ἀντόπιον ὕδωρ*)."⁶ If that had been the meaning, it would have been easy to make it clear by substituting *διεπέρασεν* or *διῆλθεν* for *ἀπῆλθεν*. *Διαπεράω* is used in Mk v. 21, vi. 53, Mt. ix. 1, xiv. 34 about crossing the Lake, and *διέρχισθαι* in Mk iv. 35, Lk. viii. 22. The text of Jn suggests that Jesus passed into the translacustrian region without going across the Lake.

⁶ Jn vi. 16, 22. R.V. "save one," though literal, is misleading.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

statements—which can hardly be explained as originating from Johannine symbolism or dramatic picturesqueness—may perhaps be explained by supposing that there were very early differences of tradition about the manner in which Jesus and the disciples passed to, and returned from, the translacustrian scene of the Feeding of the Five Thousand¹. Later on, at the conclusion of the Feeding of the Four Thousand, we shall find Mark saying that Jesus crossed to “the parts of Dalmanutha,” whereas Matthew says that He crossed to “the borders of Magadan,” and there are reasons for thinking that both of these names are not real place-names but phrases mistaken for place-names, such as “*their haven*” or “*the parts [of the] opposite [coast]*”². If that is probable it strengthens the probability that, in the present Lucan passage, “Bethsaida” is not a place-name, but a phrase mistaken for a place-name, “*House of Provision*”³.

¹ In John, some mention of these details might seem necessary to explain how it came to pass that many of the Five Thousand, immediately after the miracle on the eastern side of the Lake, were addressed by Jesus in Capernaum, on the western side.

² Mk. viii. 10, Mt. xv. 39. As regards “Dalmanutha,” see *Corrections* 498 g, h, which gives as alternatives (1) the emphatic form of the Talmudic word for “harbour”—a Hebraized form of *λμῆν*—preceded by the relative *d-*, so as to mean “belonging to the harbour,” (2) a transliteration, in Mark, of the preceding word “parts” (*μέρη*, *קטלית*). But it should have been added that, against the second explanation, Prof. Dalman says (and gives evidence to shew) that (*Words* p. 66) “τὰ μέρη with the meaning of ‘district’ is a pure Graecism, quite incapable of being literally reproduced in Aramaic.” In Ps. cvii. 30 “the *haven* of their desire,” the Syr. has, for “haven,” a form of *λμῆν* (*Thes. Syr.* 1952, comp. 1941) common in Syriac. This favours the hypothesis called (1) above. For R.V. “haven,” Gesen. 562 b has “city.” See below, p. 243, n. 4.

³ Comp. Macar. p. 85 “For He satisfied five thousand, having caused them to lie down in the desert as if it were a *Megalopolis* (ὡς εἰς μεγαλόπολιν κατακλίνας τὴν ἔρημον).”

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 10. Signs of conflation in Mark

Writing of Christ's eastward passage together with the disciples across the Lake, Mark describes the people as "*knowing*" them and as "*running together* from all the cities." In the following verse he omits the Matthew-Luke tradition that Jesus "*healed*" the people, but inserts—what Matthew and Luke do not contain—that He "*taught*" them¹. Later on, writing of Christ's westward return across the Lake, Mark—as we shall presently find—says again that people at Gennesaret "*knew*" Him, and that they "*ran about*" or "*ran round*"². And there he adds, at great length, that the sick were healed by Jesus in the "*market-places*"³. Later still, after the Feeding of the Four Thousand, Mark describes Jesus as coming to "*Dalmanutha*." This name—non-occurrent elsewhere inside, or outside, the Bible—has been shewn to be explicable as an allusion to the Psalmist's "*haven*" in "*the haven* of their desire"⁴, a Hebrew word that occurs nowhere else in the Bible but is frequent in Aramaic, meaning "*open place*," "*street*," "*market-place*." Something of the nature of a *harbour* is suggested in the tradition peculiar to Mark "*they moored-to-the-shore*"⁵.

¹ Mk vi. 33—4.

² Mk vi. 54—5 *περιδραμον*, "*ran about*," occurs nowhere else in N.T. In LXX it occurs twice and in both cases = Heb. שׁוּט (the word quoted above, pp. 230—31, from Amos and Daniel). The second instance of LXX *περιδραμον* is Jerem. v. 1 "*Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem...and seek in the broad places thereof if ye can find a man, if there be any that doeth justly...and I will pardon her.*"

³ Mk vi. 56 *ἀγοαῖς*. Mt. xiv. 35 ("they brought to him all the sick") omits "*market-places*."

⁴ See note above, p. 242, on Ps. cvii. 30 "*haven* (חֹמֶת)." Levy iii. 70 gives the word as = (1) "*city*," (2) *Machos*, the name of a place, (3) any enclosed place. Levy Ch. ii. 23 gives it as freq. = "*town with market-place*," and also "*market-place*," as in Lam. ii. 19 (Targ.).

⁵ Mk vi. 53 "...unto Gennesaret and moored-to-the-shore (καὶ

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

It is necessary to look forward here to these later Marcan passages in order to take a collective view of Mark's whole narrative. For if we find clear signs of reiteration in the employment of one word of prophetic use, such as "*run-to-and-fro*," we ought to be prepared to find them in other words. And if they are found, then we must recognise that all this Marcan account of the sequel of the Baptist's death must be regarded as coming from sources quite different from those of the narrative of the death itself. In that narrative there is diffuseness but little or no room for prophetic allusion, and there are few or no signs of Marcan "conflation." But here we seem to be in an altogether different atmosphere, so that we may expect continuous conflations such as might be exemplified in many LXX renderings, and especially in Daniel¹. The influence of this consideration extends beyond the Feeding of the Five Thousand to its sequel. This, in all the Evangelists but Luke, contains a description of Christ appearing to the disciples in their boat while, as Matthew says, it was being "*sorely tried* (literally, *tormented*) *by the waves*"; but Mark, besides saying that the disciples themselves were being "*sorely tried* (literally, *tormented*)" adds that they were "*in the act of rowing*"; and John, too, describes the disciples as "*rowing*". Now the regular Hebrew and Aramaic word for "*row*" is the same as that which we have been commenting on above, as meaning "*run-to-and-fro*"

προσπομίσθσαν)," Mt. xiv. 34 "unto Gennesaret." Προπομίζω does not occur in LXX nor again in N.T. Delitzsch renders Mark "*and they drew near to the dry land*," the Clementine transl. has "*and they drew near the shore of the sea*." D, SS, a, b, and Corb. omit it. Steph. Thes. vi. 1974 quotes figurative uses of it from Demosth. p. 795, 14 πρὸς οὗς αὐτὸς ἔχουσε λυμένας (misericordiae)...πρὸς τοὺτους μὴ προσπομίζου, and from Philostr. p. 717.

¹ See *Clus* 127 on Dan. iv. 19, also 106—111 on 2 S. xxiv. 19—20 compared with 1 Chr. xxi. 19—20, and 95 foll. on "Longer Conflations."

² Mk vi. 48, Mt. xiv. 24, Jn vi. 19.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

in Amos and Daniel¹. And the question will come before us whether John is here deliberately intervening in favour of Mark—against Matthew, who omits the word “*rowing*,” and still more against Luke, who omits the whole of the story about “*rowing*”—and, if so, in what sense, whether symbolical or otherwise.

§ II. “*On foot*,” in Mark and Matthew²

Why does Luke omit “*on foot*”? One reason may be that in Hebrew, “a multitude following [a leader] *at his feet*” may be confused with “a multitude following *on their feet*.” But another reason may be that Luke did not perceive a latent allusion in the Marcan phrase, which he consequently deemed superfluous.

Mark is describing a miracle akin to that of the Manna, which speedily followed the departure of Israel from Egypt. And the description of that departure contains the first mention of the phrase “*on foot*” to be found in our English Version of the Bible: “about six hundred thousand [that were] *on foot*.” There the Hebrew adds “the men [of military age], besides children.” Rabbi Ishmael explains that “children” includes

¹ Jon. i. 13 (Heb.) has the exceptional word חָתַר “dug [into the sea],” but the Targ. has שָׁטָם, which is used of “rowing” in Heb. of Is. xxxiii. 21, Ezek. xxvii. 8, 26.

² Mk vi. 33, Mt. xiv. 13. R.V. marg. “*by land*.” Delitzsch “*on their feet*.”

³ *Clue 75—6* contains an attempt to explain Mk vi. 33, Mt. xiv. 13 thus. See 2 S. xv. 16—18 (bis) בְּרַגְלָיו, Walton “in pedibus suis,” (*semel*) בְּרַגְלָו, Walton “in pede suo,” R.V. (*ter*) “after him,” Targ. (*ter*) “cum illo,” LXX (1) τοῖς ποσσὶν αὐτῶν, (2) περὶ v. r. περὶ, (3) τοῖς ποσσὶν αὐτῶν. Comp. Jer. xii. 5 “thou hast run with the *footmen*,” LXX “thy *feet* run.”

⁴ “*On foot*,” so R.V. here (Exod. xii. 37), but the same Heb. is rendered “*footmen*” in Numb. xi. 21 “Six hundred thousand *footmen* (רַגְלִי) [are] the people...” See below, pp. 349—50.

⁵ Exod. xii. 37 “the men [of military age]” *ha-gebārīm*, Rashi “men above 20 years old.” The first instance of *geber* is in Exod. x. 11 “Go now, *the men* [among you]...” where Moses has

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"women," and Rabbi Jonathan adds "the aged"¹—additions that may illustrate the words added by Matthew alone at the conclusion of both the Miracles of Feeding, "besides women and children²."

In the Fourth Gospel there is nothing on the surface to indicate Johannine intervention in favour of Mark here. On the contrary John rather seems to favour Matthew-Luke by himself saying, as they do, that the multitude "followed" Jesus³. He does not add "*on their feet*"; although, later on, he certainly implies that they did not come by boat and leaves us to infer that they came on foot⁴. The picture he gives us is of Jesus on a mountain, first looking down and seeing that the multitude that had been following Him is now approaching, and then descending to give them food. If therefore "*foot*" is to enter at all into the Johannine picture, it would seem that we are to think of the crowd as down below at the feet of Jesus, somewhat as the Song of Moses says concerning Israel at Sinai, "They sat down *at thy feet*, [everyone] shall receive (*marg.* received) of thy words⁵."

But John goes on to say "Now the passover, *the feast of the Jews*, was nigh⁶." And it is at all events worth noting that both in New Hebrew and in Aramaic the word "*foot*" is very frequently used to denote "*a feast*," and especially one of the three great feasts. Possibly therefore John may be following a tradition that explained "*on foot*" as "*at the feast*," to which

asked (x. 9) that "young" and "old" may go; Rashi explains that Pharaoh is refusing to let the children go.

¹ See *Mechilt.* on Exod. xii. 37. Jer. Targ. on Exod. xii. 37 adds "*none riding on horses except the children*"—apparently intended to explain antithetically the phrase "*on foot*" applied to the men.

² This addition is contained in Mt. xv. 38 as well as Mt. xiv. 21. See below on Mk vi. 44, p. 348 foll.

³ Jn vi. 2, Mt. xiv. 13, Lk. ix. 11 "followed."

⁴ See above, p. 241.

⁵ Deut. xxxiii. 3 LXX ὑπὸ σέ, Aq. τοῖς ποσὶ σου.

⁶ Jn vi. 4.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

John added an explanatory context indicating that it was "*the passover*¹."

It is not contended that the Johannine "passover" is proved to represent the Marcan "on foot." The evidence is not sufficient for that. But, in view of the multitude of positive proofs of the rule of Johannine Intervention, the evidence is sufficient here for at least a negative conclusion—it is not proved that the rule fails, and there is nothing unreasonable in the supposition that the rule holds².

§ 12. "*He had compassion,*" in Mark and Matthew³

The verb here rendered "*had compassion*" means literally "*had [the] bowels [of his compassion opened]*"⁴. In the Healing of the Leper Mark alone used this word⁵. Here Matthew follows Mark in using it, but Luke does not⁶. It is therefore a case where we should expect Johannine intervention.

If we ask why Luke omitted it here, we shall find that it cannot well be because the word is unknown in the LXX and in literary Greek; for Luke uses it elsewhere thrice, and once

¹ See Levy iv. 424—5, which shews that this meaning of "*foot*" was very common, and that the double meaning of the term was sometimes played upon. The phrase "*in the foot of*" also meant (ib.) "*on account of*," so that "they followed *on account of* Jesus [and His signs]" (comp. Jn vi. 2) might be expressed by "*at the feet of Jesus*." "*Foot*" is also thus used in Aramaic (Levy Ch. ii. 406 a). Gesen. 290 b renders נִתְּנָה (LXX ἐορτάζω) not "*feast*," but "*make-pilgrimage*," "*keep a pilgrim-feast*."

² It is not contended that John is right. Further reasons will be given below (pp. 348—51) for thinking that Mark's tradition alluded to the phrase "*on foot*," or "*footmen*," connected with the exodus of Israel from Egypt.

³ Mk vi. 34, Mt. xiv. 14.

⁴ Comp. the use of the noun in 1 Jn iii. 17 A.V. "*shut up his bowels [of compassion]*," R.V. "*his compassion*," τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ.

⁵ Mk i. 41, σπλαγχνίζομαι, "*a new verb in the Greek language*," see *Proclam.* pp. 251—2.

⁶ Mk vi. 34, Mt. xiv. 14 ἐσπλαγγνίσθη, Lk. ix. 11 ἀποδεξάμενος.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

about Jesus¹. But it may be explained by his other contextual variations from Mark. Mark states, as the reason for compassion, "They were as sheep that had no shepherd," and then "He began to teach them many things"—as though the whole multitude were spiritually shepherdless and pitifully ignorant of spiritual things. Later on, Mark says about the disciples, "They understood not [the truth] about the loaves, but their heart was callous²"—as though, even by the disciples, some latent spiritual truth, underlying the sign of the Feeding, had been overlooked. All this is omitted by Luke. It would not suit his comparatively prosaic and passionless representation: "Having received (*or*, welcomed) them, He proceeded to speak to them about the kingdom of God, and to heal those that needed tendance³." Apparently Luke did not see that the occasion was one that called for a feeling so strong as to need the Marcan word to describe it.

Passing to John, we perceive that in accordance with Mark's brief observation—but at much greater length, and not in his own words but in words attributed to Jesus—he lays stress on the spiritual meaning of the Feeding, which not only the multitude but also almost all the disciples misunderstood. But neither here nor elsewhere in his Gospel does he mention "bowels of compassion." Can we say, then, that he implies it either here or elsewhere?

It will seem probable that he does, if we bear in mind the Johannine habit of dramatizing and ask ourselves how John would dramatically represent Jesus as "*having-bowels-of-compassion*." The Johannine Epistle says, about Him, "Hereby know we love, because *he laid down his life for us*, and we

¹ Lk. vii. 13 (of Jesus at Nain), x. 33, xv. 20 (all peculiar to Luke).

² Mk vi. 52, not in the parall. Mt. xiv. 33. Luke omits the whole narrative (the Walking on the Sea).

³ Lk. ix. 11 ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς χρεῖαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰάτο.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

ought to *lay down our lives* for the brethren. But whoso hath the world's goods, and beholdeth his brother in need and *shutteth up his bowels* from him, how doth the love of God abide in him¹?" The "*shutting up of the bowels*" of compassion, then, is the Johannine opposite of Christ's sacrifice, or "laying down life" for others. It follows that the "opening, or free action, of *the bowels of compassion*" would be the Johannine equivalent of Christ's "*laying down His life for the brethren.*" Now though the word "*bowels*" is not mentioned in the whole of the Fourth Gospel, yet the thing—that is to say, a yearning compassion for the hunger and the thirst of the sinful world, and a longing to lay down life that the world may live—is implied, not only in the words "The bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world," but in the whole of the doctrine of the gift of His flesh and blood, enunciated "in synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum²."

If this view is correct, John is expressing dramatically and symbolically a moral and sacrificial view of the Feeding of the Five Thousand of which there is no trace in Luke. Mark and Matthew suggest it twice, first, by saying that Jesus "*had compassion,*" and later on, in the Feeding of the Four Thousand, by representing Jesus Himself as saying "*I have compassion.*" John seems to attempt to make us feel that in this "sign" Jesus is (so to speak) "*doing compassion,*" i.e. symbolically offering up Himself, as a sacrifice for men. In the Epistle to Philemon Paul calls Onesimus first his "*child*" and then his "*bowels,*" and *The Testaments of the Patriarchs* represents Joseph as saying to his brethren "Pity the *bowels* of Jacob our father," meaning "Pity his beloved son³." Philo also represents

¹ 1 Jn iii. 16—17.

² Jn vi. 51—9.

³ Philem. 10, 12, *Test. XII Patr. Zab.* ii. 2. *Comp. ib. Neph.* iv. 5 "until there shall come the *bowels* (σπλάγχνον) of the Lord, a man doing righteousness."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Jacob as calling Joseph "*my bowels*"¹. Thus there was a connection, for Jews in the first century, not at first perceptible to us, between "*compassion*" and "*a son*," or rather "*a dear son*," "*a son specially beloved*."

If this connection is obscure to us it must have been much more obscure to Greeks in the first century. For to them the word "*bowels*," though conveying often the notion of some strong inward feeling, more often implied depth of resentment than depth of love². It was therefore an appropriate task for the Fourth Evangelist to make this connection clear. He himself certainly believed that the Sign of the Five Thousand was a sign of God's love in sending down His Compassion incarnate in Jesus Christ to give Himself as the living bread for the life of men. This he found hinted at in the Marcan tradition about "*bowels of compassion*," but only hinted at—and so obscurely that Luke passed it over in word and neglected it in thought. To remedy this defect John may have adopted "*Son*"—meaning "*a Son uniquely beloved, or only-begotten*"—as a Hellenic paraphrase for the Hebrew "*bowels of compassion*"³. At all events he represents Jesus as teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum a consistent doctrine such as might be based on this paraphrase.

In conclusion we may naturally ask what induced Mark to use—if not to invent—this unprecedented Greek verb (unprecedented at least so far as researches of modern commentators go) to express Christ's compassion. Might he not have used

¹ Philo ii. 45 rhetorically represents Jacob as saying that the wild beasts, in devouring Joseph, devour τῶν ἐμῶν σπλάγχνων.

² See Steph. *Thes.* which alleges, as exceptional uses, σπλάγχνον "de utero," of fatherhood in Soph. *Oed. T.* 1066, and of motherhood in Pind. *Ol.* vi. 43 and Aesch. *Sept.* 1031.

³ Comp. *Test. XII Patr. Lev.* iv. 4, where the text has "The Lord shall visit all the Gentiles in His bowels [*of compassion*]," but several versions have, as a Christian modification, "*in the bowels [of compassion] of His Son*."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the verb "pitied," frequent in LXX and thrice used by himself¹? It is hardly enough to say Mark wanted to express abundant or extreme pity, for he could have added adverbs (as he adds them elsewhere) to express this².

It is reasonable therefore to look back to O.T. for some Biblical instance of a phrase implying "bowels of compassion." A notable one—almost the only one outside the prophets—occurs in Genesis, where it is said of Joseph that "*his bowels did yearn upon his brother*"³. The context describes Joseph's brethren as coming to buy corn from him. Jewish Christians from a very early date would naturally accept Joseph as a type of Christ; and Joseph, giving food to his brethren in Egypt, might represent one aspect (a rudimentary one) of Jesus giving food to His brethren in the wilderness⁴. Then the compassion of Jesus for the multitude, whom He fed as His little ones, might be likened in early Christian poetry to the "bowels of compassion" of Joseph—who was himself called "the bowels of Jacob," as we have seen above—"yearning" for his beloved brother Benjamin, "the little one" among the Twelve. Thoughts of this kind may well have been in the mind of those who originated early Christian songs and poetic traditions concerning Christ's acts of compassion for the hunger and thirst of the multitudes.

¹ ἔλεειν, of which there are about 150 instances in O.T.

² E.g. σφόδρα, λίαν, περισσῶς.

³ Gen. xliii. 30 (where the marg. gives only 1 K. iii. 26 (apart from prophecy)). I have found no ancient comment on the rather curious use of "lift up the eyes" in the context (*ib.* 28—9) "And they [*i.e.* Joseph's brethren]...made obeisance. And he [*i.e.* Joseph] *lifted up his eyes*, and saw Benjamin his brother."

⁴ See Jerome on Ps. cv. 21 "He made him [Joseph] lord of his house." Jerome explains "house" as "the Church acquired by [His] blood."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 13. "*They were as sheep not having a shepherd,*" in Mark and Matthew¹

The mention of a shepherdless flock comes appropriately here in Mark, because it follows the account of the execution of John the Baptist whom many Jews had been regarding as their "shepherd." Matthew places it earlier, between what may be called a Circuit of Healing and the Mission of the Twelve². Luke nowhere inserts it. Textual grounds may suffice perhaps for a partial explanation of his omitting it here³. But Luke will be found also to omit, much later on, another Mark-Matthew tradition about "the shepherd"—the quotation, attributed to Jesus, "I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered⁴." We must therefore not ignore the possibility that Luke may have been influenced by some doubt as to the utility of this tradition for his readers. The conception of a king as a shepherd is both Hebrew and Homeric. Yet it was liable to philosophic scoffing such as Epictetus addresses to Homer's Agamemnon: "What then are you? A '*shepherd*' in truth. For you weep like *the shepherds* when a wolf snatches one of their sheep⁵."

¹ Mk vi. 34, comp. Mt. ix. 36.

² Mt. ix. 35 "And Jesus went about all the cities and the villages, teaching...and preaching...and healing all...sickness." This is parall. to Mk vi. 6 "And he went about the villages round about, teaching." Neither Mk vi. 6 nor the parall. Lk. xiii. 22 (which adds "journeying to Jerusalem") makes any mention of "healing." Mt. ix. 36 proceeds "When he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion (*ἐσπλαγχνίσθη*) for them because they were...as sheep not having a shepherd." Then follows (Mt. ix. 37, x. 1) the injunction to pray for "labourers" for "the harvest," and the Mission of the Twelve.

³ See below, p. 256 foll.

⁴ Mk xiv. 27, Mt. xxvi. 31, om. by Lk. xxii. 39 foll. The quotation in the Gospels differs from the Heb. of Zech. xiii. 7. There are special reasons why Luke might omit it. See *Son* (Index "Shepherd").

⁵ Epict. iii. 22. 35 "*snatches* (*ἀρπάσσει*)," comp. Jn x. 12 "the

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

The Fourth Gospel, whether consciously alluding to such jibes or unconsciously using language that meets them, vindicates at all events the character of the ideal shepherd. It admits that the ideal has not been reached, and that all who have come forward hitherto, representing themselves as true shepherds, have been, as compared with the true Shepherd, "thieves and robbers¹." But it claims for the Good Shepherd a very different part. The thief (it says) comes to "steal" and to "destroy"; the wolf comes to "snatch"; the hireling "fleeth"; but the Good Shepherd comes, not only to give food to the sheep, but also, by "laying down his life" in conflict with "the wolf," to save them from being "snatched."

John has in mind the thought of the false king, the king of Babel, the hunter or "snatcher" of the souls of men, the wolf². The true king is He who, as Paul says, "being in the form of God, counted it not a [prize-for-]snatching to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant³." Yet the Jews in Jerusalem accused Jesus, in effect, of doing this very thing, "making himself equal with God⁴," that is to say, "snatching" at it as a "prize." And what are we to say to the fact that the only other Johannine mention of "snatching" comes at the conclusion of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, in a passage implying the complete failure of the multitude to understand the spiritual meaning of the sign: "They were about to come and *snatch him* [away] to make him king⁵"? Is it a mere accident that the sheep of Israel, whom Jesus

wolf *snatcheth* (ἀρᾶς) them." Perhaps one of Luke's reasons for omitting the tradition of Mk vi. 34 was that he thought it attached too great importance to the recent death of John the Baptist.

¹ Jn x. 8, see *Joh. Gr.* 2381—2.

² Philo ii. 41—42, 90 contrasts "shepherding" which is the fit training for a king, with "hunting" which is the training for war.

³ Philipp. ii. 6 "a [prize-for-]snatching (ἀρπαγμόν)."

⁴ Jn v. 18.

⁵ Jn vi. 15. Ἀρᾶς occurs in Jn, elsewhere, only in x. 12, 28, 29 (the Good Shepherd and the comment on it).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

came to save from "*the snatcher*," are here described as themselves desiring to "*snatch [away]*" their Shepherd that they may convert Him into a "*king*" after their own hearts—a veritable wolf? In imputing to John a deliberate choice of a peculiar phrase to describe a fact we do not impugn the fact itself. The fact in the present instance—the attempt to make Jesus a king—may be accepted as historical because of its antecedent probability, although no other Evangelist mentions it; but the choice of the word to express the fact may not improbably have been suggested by the Johannine sense of irony.

§ 14. "*Shepherd*" (sing.) *nowhere mentioned by Luke*

Both Matthew and Luke mention an owner of sheep as follows:

Mt. xviii. 12 (R.V.)

How think ye? if any man have a hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and go....¹, and seek that which goeth astray?

Lk. xv. ^{*}4 (R.V.)

What man of you, having a hundred sheep, and having lost one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine...., and go after that which is lost, until he find it?

The man's conduct seems open to censure—especially in Luke's version, which represents him as "leaving to themselves" or "abandoning²," the ninety-nine sheep. At all events opponents of Christianity might object to such a human shepherd as the type of the divine Shepherd. Perhaps some might say he was no true shepherd. Readers of Philo would know that he distinguishes the "cattle-feeder" from the "shepherd" as follows, "Now to those who allow their beasts to fill themselves with what they desire in a promiscuous mass we must

¹ R.V. "leave the ninety and nine and go unto the mountains," W.H. "leave the ninety and nine on the mountains and go."

² Lk. xv. 4 καταλείπει, comp. Mt. xviii. 12 ἀφήσει.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

give the name of 'cattle-feeders,' but that of 'shepherds' on the other hand to those who give them what is needful and only what is exactly suitable¹." The man who "abandoned" his ninety-nine sheep (it might be urged) did not discharge the duty of a shepherd and was not worthy of the name.

Jerome gives two explanations of the parable. Some think (he says) that the Shepherd is the incarnate Son descending to save the one wandering sheep below, the human race (in which case the ninety-nine would be, presumably, the angels in heaven); others think that the ninety-nine are those whom He called "just persons that need no repentance²." In the latter case, the parable is still open to the jibe of Celsus, who asked "what evil" these just persons had done to incur the punishment of being abandoned³. It is only a prosaic or captious spirit that would take literally this "abandonment" of the safe and unwandering sheep, but still the Fourth Evangelist might naturally feel that there was room for another exposition of the tasks of the Good Shepherd in which He might be described as performing one task without neglecting another⁴.

Luke, in his only mention of "flock," calls it a "little one" and connects it with "kingdom," "Fear not, little *flock*; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the *kingdom*⁵"; and again, in his parallel to the Marcan passage that speaks of "teaching" and "sheep without a shepherd," Luke mentions

¹ Philo i. 306 "cattle-feeders," κτηνοτρόφους.

² Lk. xv. 7.

³ Orig. *Cels.* iii. 62.

⁴ Philo, besides quoting Numb. xxvii. 16 foll. from LXX "sheep that have no shepherd," with the paraphrase (i. 307) χωρίς ἐπιστάτου καὶ ἡγεμόνος, also alludes to it (i. 170) δίχα ἐπιστάτου καὶ ἡγεμόνος, without quoting it. Such a condition he calls (*ib.*) ὀρφανίαν (comp. Jn xiv. 18).

⁵ Lk. xii. 32 τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον, on which see Son 3440 b quoting Clem. Alex. 953, who uses Lk. and Mt. xviii. 10 μικρῶν to illustrate Christ's doctrine of "little ones." This would make good sense, "flock of the little-ones," i.e. flock of the children of the New Kingdom.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"kingdom¹." Somewhat similarly in one of the Psalms, where the Hebrew has "he *shepherded* them," and the R.V. "he *fed* them," the Targum has "he *reigned* over them²." Such variations of rendering are all justifiable. But they imply preferences of this or that aspect of "*shepherding*."

Luke seems to like the royal aspect. John, if he does not dislike, at all events avoids it. He represents Jesus as using the word "*kingdom*" on only two occasions, namely, in dialogues with Nicodemus and Pilate, both of whom misunderstand it³. Also, in John, the flock is not called "little," though it is divided, at the close of his Gospel, into three classes, one of which consists of "little-sheep⁴." In the Parable of the Good Shepherd we are told that the sheep are of more than one fold, though they will all be brought together so as to make "one flock, one shepherd⁵."

§ 15. "*And he began to teach them many things,*" in Mark

The parallel Matthew-Luke makes no mention of "teaching," but Matthew mentions "curing," and Luke has "welcoming" and "speaking about the kingdom of God" and "healing⁶." An explanation of these variations is afforded by the hypothesis of an original Hebrew verb "*to shepherd*." Mark has given us a hint of this in his negative phrase above discussed ("sheep not having a *shepherd*"). But we have now to note that the Hebrew verb "*to shepherd*" occurs more frequently in the Bible than might be supposed. The English Version does not reveal it, because "shepherding" includes various actions such as feeding and tending, which may be expressed in English

¹ Mk vi. 34, Lk. ix. 11.

² Ps. lxxviii. 72.

³ See *Joh. Voc.* 1685 a quoting Jn iii. 3, 5, xviii. 36.

⁴ Jn xxi. 15—17 (txt doubtful).

⁵ Jn x. 16.

⁶ Mk vi. 34 ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά, Mt. xiv. 14 ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν, Lk. ix. 11 ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς χρεῖαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἔλατο.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

by their several verbs "feed," "tend," etc. This is the first and probably the principal cause of variation. A second cause is the accidental similarity of the Hebrew verb "*shepherd*" to forms of the verb meaning "*know*" or "*cause to know*" (i.e. "*teach*").

This second cause has been discussed in a previous treatise¹. One of the instances there given deserves to be repeated here because it illustrates both causes at the same time: "The lips of the righteous [man] *shepherd* many²." Here "to *shepherd*" may mean "to *guide*," or "*tend*," as well as "*feed*," but LXX has confused it with "*know*," meaning "[*come to*] *know*," i.e. "*learn*." Moreover the LXX renders "many" (the Hebrew *rab*) as though it meant "great" or "lofty," and renders the whole sentence "The lips of the righteous [*come to*] *know* lofty [things]." This suggests an explanation of the phrase in our Marcan context "*and many knew [them, or him]*," as being an error for "*and he caused-to-know many*," i.e. either "*he taught many [persons]*," or "*he taught [them] many [things]*"—which is, in substance, the phrase at the heading of this section.

More important than this verbal cause is the cause placed first above—namely, the Hebrew thought and stream of tradition about God's "*shepherding*." Jacob illustrates it when he begins his career at Bethel, praying that the Lord would guide him, guard him, and feed him³; and he expressly mentions the word when he closes his career in Egypt, invoking

¹ See *Son* 3437 *c—d*, which refers to *Clue* 5, 7, and 90, and deals with Mk vi. 34 and the parall. Mt.-Lk. from the verbal point of view.

² Prov. x. 21 (R.V.) "*feed* (יָרַע)," LXX ἐπισκῶσαι, "*learn*," or, "[*come to*] *know*," leg. יָרַע. Targ. retains the Heb. in רָעִין (Aram.), but in the sense "*treat-as-friends*" (Walton, "*placant*"), Aq. ποιμαίνοντες "*they shepherd*," Field "*pascunt* (i.e. *erudiunt*)."
In Job xxxii. 7, the causative "*make to know*" יָרַעו, i.e. "*teach*," is rendered by LXX "*know*."

³ Gen. xxviii. 20 "If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go and will give me bread to eat...."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"the God that *shepherded* me all my life long unto this day¹." Moses implied "*shepherding*" when he besought the Lord to appoint a successor to himself "that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep that have no shepherd²." And all his life testified that he too, like Jacob, recognised that the good shepherd on earth was the type of the Shepherd in heaven, the God that had guided Israel out of Egypt and guarded and fed them in the wilderness; to whom the Psalmist appealed as Shepherd of Israel and of whom the Psalmist said "The Lord is *my shepherd*, I shall not want³."

This last sentence is one of the very few quoted from the Psalms by Philo, who speaks of it ecstatically as a song that should be sung by every man that loves God, and above all by the Cosmos, or Universe, which is the "flock" of the living God who governs all things like a shepherd and a king⁴. Poets, he says, are wont to give to kings the title of shepherds of the people; but the Lawgiver (that is, Moses) gives this title only to the wise, who are real kings⁵. Elsewhere Philo declares that—however men may laugh at the notion—the only way of becoming a perfect king is to become an adept in the science of shepherding⁶.

¹ Gen. xlviii. 15—16 "The God that hath *shepherded* me all my life long unto this day, the Angel that hath redeemed me from all evil..." Gen. i. *ad loc.*, assuming that "*shepherding*" means nourishing, says that it is a greater work (as in Ps. cxlv. 16) to "*shepherd*" than to "*redeem*," the former being the act of "God," the latter of "the angel," and that the "*shepherding*" is as difficult as the cleaving of the Red Sea.

² Numb. xxvii. 17.

³ Ps. lxxx. 1, xxiii. 1. Comp. Hos. iv. 16 "The Lord will *shepherd* them, i.e. Israel," R.V. "*feed*," Targ. "*deducet*," LXX *νεμήσει*, Is. xl. 11 "Like a shepherd his flock shall he *shepherd*," and sim. Targ., LXX *ποιμανεῖ*.

⁴ Philo i. 308.

⁵ Philo i. 306.

⁶ Philo ii. 90 καὶ μοι δοκεῖ. . . μόνος ἂν γενέσθαι βασιλεὺς τέλειος ὁ τὴν ποιμενικὴν ἐπιστήμην ἀγαθός.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

In a very different strain, yet to the same effect, the Jewish comment on "The Lord is my shepherd" declares that the "shepherd" includes the three characters of Father, Shepherd (as Guide and Guardian), and Brother, and it adds a very early tradition that, although the occupation of the shepherd with his staff and scrip is commonly believed to be one of the meanest on earth, David "knew better." David argued thus: "Jacob called the Lord a Shepherd, saying 'The God that *shepherded* me all my life long'; therefore I, too, will call Him a *Shepherd* and will say 'The Lord is my *Shepherd*!'"

The longest of the historical Psalms leads up to the shepherding of Israel as its climax. It tells us how Israel wandered in the wilderness, "led" by God's "cloud" and "fire," and receiving from Him "manna," or "corn of heaven," and "bread" and "meat to the full," and "flesh." All these gifts—which imply guidance and food such as a shepherd gives—were yet to no purpose for Israel because "their heart was not right with him¹." But the last three verses describe how Israel was finally "*shepherded*" by God's chosen representative: "He chose David also his servant and took him from the sheep-folds...to *shepherd* Jacob his people and Israel his inheritance; so he *shepherded* them according to the integrity of his heart and guided them by the skilfulness of his hands²."

¹ See *Tehill.* on Ps. xxxiii. 1 (Wü. pp. 209—10) giving several traditions on "my shepherd." The first tradition of all is a comment on "my" (in "my shepherd"). It begins from Cant. ii. 16 "My beloved is *mine* and I am *his*," and passes to Exod. xx. 2 "I am Jehovah, *thy* God," Is. li. 4 "*my* nation."

² Ps. lxxviii. 14—37. In *ib.* 52 "he led forth his people *like* sheep and guided them in the wilderness *like* a flock," we are brought to the thought of the sheep, but not to the word "shepherd."

³ Ps. lxxviii. 70—72. This is quoted in *Exod.* i. on Exod. iii. 1 "And Moses was *shepherding* the flock," where it is said that Moses (as also David afterwards) divided the sheep into three classes (comp. Jn xxi. 15 foll.) according to age, so that he might feed them suitably. We are also told that Moses, finding a lamb that had

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Returning to the Synoptic tradition under consideration, we see that Mark's "began to teach them many things," though cold and inadequate in itself, becomes less inadequate if regarded in the light of the Marcan context, which depicts Jesus as compassionating the multitude because they were "as sheep without a shepherd." Luke's text, which mentions "welcoming" and "healing" as well as "speaking about the kingdom of God," is more adequate than the tradition of Mark ("to teach them many things") taken by itself, but misses the thought of "compassion" and all the deep pathos implied in Hebrew traditions about the divine Shepherd to whom Israel says, "My beloved is mine and I am his¹."

John may be said to combine the Marcan "teaching" with the Lucan "welcoming" and "healing"—only expressing the latter in a more vivid and passionate way. As to "teaching," he says—at the end of Christ's long discourse about the meaning of the Feeding of the Five Thousand—"These things said Jesus...as he *taught* in Capernaum²." But in the discourse itself, he declares in effect that, under this sign, the Shepherd of Israel was revealing Himself as purposing to give His own "flesh" and "blood," to be "living bread," food and life for the flock. This doctrine Jesus sets forth in such a form that Peter, despairing of finding any other shepherd like Him, exclaims, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast words of eternal life³." Thus John places before us two characters, briefly hinted at in Mark—the character of the Teacher and the character of the Compassionate Shepherd. The latter—which in Luke is limited to the Seeker after one lost sheep—

strayed away through thirst, took it on his shoulder to bring it back to the flock. Whereupon God said "Thou hast shewn compassion in leading sheep of flesh and blood. By thy life! thou shalt also shepherd my sheep, the flock of Israel."

¹ Cant. ii. 16.

² Jn vi. 59. *Διδάσκω*, in Johannine narrative, occurs elsewhere only in vii. 14, 28, viii. 20.

³ Jn vi. 68.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

John does not intend to describe or even to mention till later on¹. But he suggests it here, in anticipation, to the minds of those who meditated on the goodness of God towards Israel in preparing a table for them in the wilderness.

§ 16. "*When the day was now far spent,*" in Mark

At this point the Four Gospels diverge². The difference resembles one already discussed in the narrative of Christ's first public acts of healing, where Mark says that "it had become late" and the sun "[had] set," Matthew that "it had become late," but Luke that the sun was still "setting³." Here Mark's expression is "an advanced hour," a comparatively rare phrase⁴. Matthew uses the more ordinary Greek expression "*evening*." This however does not seem applicable to a time before the miracle but to one after it. And such an application John seems to give it when he says further on "When *evening* came his disciples went down to the sea⁵"; Mark also himself says that "when *evening* had come," the disciples were rowing "in the midst of the sea⁶."

Luke says, "*The day began to incline* (or, *decline*)," an expression that does not recur in N.T. except in his Gospel after the Resurrection, where he uses the perfect "*Abide with us, for it is toward evening and the day has now inclined*⁷."

¹ Lk. xv. 4—6, Jn x. 11 foll.

² Mk vi. 35 καὶ ἤδη ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης (marg. γενομένης), Mt. xiv. 15 ὥφιας δὲ γενομένης, Lk. ix. 12 ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν.

³ Proclamation p. 213 foll. on Mk i. 32, Mt. viii. 16, Lk. iv. 40.

⁴ Wetstein on Mk vi. 35 quotes Dion. Hal. *Ant.* ii. 54 ἐμάχοντο καὶ διήμερον ἄχρι πολλῆς ὥρας...ἀγωνιζόμενοι ἕως ἡ νύξ ἐπιλαβοῦσα διακρίνεν αὐτοῖς. Steph. *Thes.* quotes Polyb. v. 8. 3, and Joseph. *Ant.* viii. 4. 3. Thucydides uses πολλή with νύξ.

⁵ Jn vi. 16 ὥς δὲ ὥφια ἐγένετο.

⁶ Mk vi. 47 καὶ ὥφιας γενομένης ἦν τὸ πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης. The context implies a time subsequent to that implied by John.

⁷ Lk. xxiv. 29 πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἐστὶν καὶ κέκλιεν ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

The "day," or the sun, is said to "incline" not only in Greek and Latin but also once in Hebrew¹, and it may "incline" toward "afternoon" as well as toward "evening." Luke, by saying "*began to incline*" here and "*has inclined*" elsewhere, seems to intend to emphasize "*began*" here, so as to mean "*incline toward afternoon*." In the story of Emmaus there are reasons for thinking that Luke is imitating the language of the LXX². But there are no such reasons here. It seems probable that Luke is here using an expression, frequent in Greek and Latin, and capable of meaning with slight modifications "afternoon" or "evening," by which he corrects an error of Mark's in such a way that a Greek reader of the Gospels might say: "Mark has taken '*when the day was inclining*' for '*when the day had inclined*' and has paraphrased it in the latter sense. Luke has restored the original phrase, leaving his readers to give it its correct sense."

Some Hebrew original like "between the two evenings"—used about the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb—might explain the Synoptic variations. Such an original has already been suggested as capable of explaining the Synoptic variations in the accounts of Christ's first public healing³. Still more appropriately would it explain them here. For in that earlier narrative there was nothing that pointed to the Passover. But there is much of that nature here. It is antecedently probable that the Galilaean Church would use expressions likening the Feeding of the Five Thousand to the Eucharist or to a prophetic sign of the Eucharist, a preliminary type of a Christian Passover.

¹ Judg. xix. 8 (R.V.) "tarry ye until the day declineth," (A.V.) "they tarried until afternoon (marg. till the day declined)." *κλίνει ημέρα* (sing.) recurs only *ib.* xix. 9—11 (A) and Jerem. vi. 4. Steph. Thes. iv. 1651 gives instances from Greek and Latin. The "declining" may be toward "evening" or toward "afternoon."

² Comp. in Judg. xix. 7 *ἰβιάσαντο*, and in Lk. xxiv. 29 *παρεβιάσαντο*, as well as the rare *κλίνει ημέρα*.

³ See *Proclamation* p. 213 foll.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

John himself tells us that "the Passover of the Jews" was "near¹." No doubt he means us to take this literally. But it would be characteristic of him to intend us also to take it as suggesting something more: "And another 'passover' was also 'near,' the Passover of the Christians." As the sacred Lamb of the Jewish Passover was slain for the sins of Israel "between the two evenings," so the same hour might be regarded in early Galilaean traditions as appropriate for Christ's announcement of the sign of the Eucharistic Sacrifice which He was destined to offer up as the Passover for the sins of the whole world.

§ 17. *"They continue with me now three days," in Mark and Matthew²*

The Feeding of the Four Thousand, in several of its expressions, gives to Christ's act a more personal note than is found in the Feeding of the Five Thousand³. It is more like Isaiah's description of the considerate Shepherd of Israel gently leading the flock⁴. Moreover Mark's preceding context

¹ Jn vi. 4.

² Mk viii. 2, Mt. xv. 32. It will be convenient to discuss the Feeding of the Four Thousand here, as a parallel to the Feeding of the Five Thousand, in order to compare and contrast the two.

³ Mk viii. 1—3 (R.V.)

Mt. xv. 32 (R.V.)

(1) In those days, when there was again a great multitude, and they had nothing to eat, he called unto him his disciples, and saith unto them,

(2) I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days, and have nothing to eat:

(3) And if I send them away fasting to their home, they will faint in the way; and some of them are come from far.

And Jesus called unto him his disciples, and said, I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days and have nothing to eat: and I would not send them away fasting, lest haply they faint in the way.

⁴ Is. xl. 11. Comp. Mk viii. 2 foll. "I have compassion" as compared with vi. 34 "he had compassion." And see Mk viii. 3 "If I send them away fasting...they will faint in the way; and

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

appears to be influenced by the language of Isaiah, describing the healing and safe guidance of ransomed Israel, returning to Jerusalem across the wilderness¹. This should prepare us to find traces of prophetic and poetic influence in the narrative that follows. Accordingly we find Jesus describing the multitude as "fasting," or "hungry," and as likely to "faint in the way," very much as the Psalmist says of the redeemed of Israel, "gathered" from the four quarters of the world, "They wandered in the wilderness in a desert way... *hungry* and thirsty, *their soul fainted in them*." "Gathering" is not so easily applicable to the Exodus from Egypt² as it is to the gathering of the scattered captives of Israel predicted by Isaiah, or to the gathering of the spiritual Israel contemplated in early Christian traditions³. To the latter there would apply the words in Mark (but not in Matthew) "*and some of*

some of them are come from far." There is nothing like this in the earlier narrative.

¹ Mk vii. 37 "He maketh even the deaf (τοὺς κωφοὺς) to hear and dumb [folk] (ἁλάλους) to speak," Mt. xv. 31 "They saw dumb [folk] (κωφοὺς) speaking... and blind [folk] (τυφλοὺς) seeing; and they glorified the God of Israel." In Mark, the preceding context describes the healing of (Mk vii. 32) κωφὸν καὶ μογιᾶλον, i.e. "deaf and *stammering*." Μογιᾶλος, "*stammering*," occurs nowhere in the Greek Bible except here and Is. xxxv. 6 τρανὴ δὲ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιᾶλων, Heb. "and the tongue of the *dumb* shall sing." Ibn Ezra reduces this to prosaic and non-miraculous fact by calling it "a figurative expression for '*they shall find water everywhere*,'" and contrasting Lam. iv. 4 "the tongue of the suckling cleaveth to the roof of his mouth for thirst." But Mark apparently takes the prophecy as predicting miraculous fact about the healing of a "*stammerer*."

² Ps. cvii. 2—5.

³ See however *Tehill. ad loc.* (Wü. ii. 134) "The Holy One said to the Israelites, 'In Egypt ye were scattered, and I gathered you in one little hour to Ramses; and now also are ye scattered into all lands, and as I gathered you in ancient days so will I gather you in the future,' as it is said... (Is. xi. 12) 'He shall gather the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.'"

⁴ Comp. Jn xi. 52 "that he might gather into one (εἰς ἓν) the scattered children of God."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

them are come from far," applicable to the old remoteness of the Gentiles, illustrated by the language of Isaiah¹.

But we must be on our guard against confining Mark to one Prophecy or one Psalm as his source. The Psalm above quoted does not mention "*three days*." But the account in Exodus on which the Psalm is based, does contain a mention of "*three days*" ("*And they went three days in the wilderness and found no water*") previously mentioned as the time necessary for a journey to be taken for the purpose of offering a sacrifice to Jehovah². Then, further, if we examine other Hebrew texts, or Jewish traditions about "*three days*," or "*the third day*," beginning from the sacrifice of Isaac on Mount Moriah, we shall find that, both in the Bible and in the Midrash and in Philo, as also in the words of Jesus about Himself, a mystical meaning is attached to the phrase³. In Philo, the sacrifice of Isaac is connected with that perfect tribute which will be duly paid by the mind, when "*perfected*," to the "*perfecting*" God: "*When therefore does it duly pay? When it arrives on the third day at the place whereof God spoke to it*." He goes on to speak of the mind at this stage as passing

¹ Eph. ii. 17 "*And he came and preached peace to you that were far off and peace to them that were nigh,*" comp. Is. lvii. 19 "*Peace, peace, to him that is far off and to him that is near.*"

² Exod. xv. 22, comp. *ib.* iii. 18, v. 3, viii. 27.

³ Gen. xxii. 3—5 "*And Abraham rose up early in the morning and saddled his ass, and took two of his young men with him and Isaac his son.... On the third day Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw the place afar off. And Abraham said unto his young men, Abide ye here with the ass....*" The context implies, but does not mention, "*two days*," preceding. Josephus mentions it, as follows: *Ant.* i. 13. 2 "*Now the two servants went along with him two days; but on the third day, as soon as he saw the mountain, he left those servants that were with him till then in the plain....*"

⁴ Philo i. 457 (playing on τέλος and its compounds) τελειωθείς ὁ νοῦς ἀποδώσει τὸ τέλος τῷ τελειοφόρῳ θεῷ... Πότε οὖν ἀποδίδωσιν; Ὅταν (Gen. xxii. 4) ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον... τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ παραγένηται....

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

by distinctions of time and migrating into "the timeless nature¹."

The very great difference of Philo's language from the simple style of the Gospels must not altogether hide the underlying resemblance of thought between this and the saying of Jesus about being "*perfected on the third day*²." The Midrash on the story of Abraham takes as its first illustration the words of Hosea "After *two days* will he cause us to live [again]; *on the third day* he will raise us up and we shall live before him³." Then, after enumerating other instances of the phrase, it introduces into the story of Abraham (what Josephus perhaps also implies in his mention of "two days") a distinction between the "servants" who do not accompany Abraham "*on the third day*," and the son who does. Abraham sees the Shechinah over the mountain, and asks his son and his two servants whether they see what he sees. The son says "Yes." The two servants say "No⁴," being only (so to speak) in the second-day stage. To them accordingly it is said "Abide ye here with the ass." But the son (it is implied) having entered the third-day stage, is allowed to go on and to be perfected on the Mount of Sacrifice.

The frequency with which Jesus is recorded in all the Gospels to have used the phrase "*on the third day*," or some similar expression, about His own resurrection, or about the restoration of the Temple, or about the approach of the Passover, makes it probable that here, in the Feeding of the Four Thousand, it is used in some allusive sense. Perhaps it

¹ Philo *ib.* παρελθὼν τὰς πλείους μοίρας τῶν χρονικῶν διαστημάτων καὶ ἔδη πρὸς τὴν ἀχρονον μεταβαίνειν φύσιν.

² Lk. xiii. 32—3 "I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow and *on the third [day]* I am [to be] perfected (τελειοῦμαι). Howbeit I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and *the next [day]*, for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem."

³ Hos. vi. 2.

⁴ This resembles (I think) something in Wagner's *Parsifal*.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

alludes to the precept twice enjoined on Israel at the Giving of the Law, "Be ready *against the third day*¹." Origen speaks of the Four Thousand as being "*testified to*," in respect of their "abiding by the Lord *for three days*²." Clement of Alexandria, writing of Abraham's "*seeing on the third day*," says that "*the three days* are the mystery of the seal³." In view of the extracts given above from Scripture, Midrash, Philo, and the Gospels, it would be unwise to dismiss these Christian comments as baseless Christian allegorizing⁴. They all point back to a widespread Hebrew conception of "*the third day*," as being not only a phrase of time but also a phrase of accomplishment, what Philo calls "the timeless nature⁵."

Passing to the Fourth Evangelist we have to consider his attitude, first, toward the Mark-Matthew tradition about a supplementary miracle of Eucharistic Feeding, and secondly, toward this mystical tradition about "three days." As to the first, while nowhere denying that there were, even before the Resurrection, other similar miracles such as the Feeding of the Four Thousand, he turns our attention to something that

¹ Exod. xix. 11, 15.

² Origen *Comm. Matth.* xi. 19 (Lomm. iii. 123).

³ Clem. Alex. 690. *Comp. Clem. Alex. Excerpt. Theod.* 988—9 where "baptism" is called ἡ σφραγίς and τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας σφράγισμα, and see Euseb. iii. 23. 8 (quoting from Clem. Alex.) τὴν σφραγίδα τοῦ κυρίου.

⁴ Jerome, however (on Mt. xv. 32), affords an instructive instance of the excesses of the Christian transmutation of Jewish tradition, "Miseretur turbae quia in trium numero, Patri, Filio, Spirituique Sancto credebant."

⁵ See p. 266, n. 1. Mark (iv. 28) speaks of (1) "the blade," (2) "the ear," (3) "the full corn." John (xii. 24) speaks of the grain of corn (1) falling, (2) dying, (3) producing fruit. Revelation (i. 4) speaks of the IS and the WAS and the COMING. Underlying the whole of the Fourth Gospel there seems to be the conception of (1) the Thought, (2) the uttered Thought, or Word, (3) the influencing Thought, or Spirit. All these are forms of the *thought* of "the third day."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

happened after the Resurrection, supplementary, but dissimilar in important details—a quiet and homely little meal, the relation of which to the Synoptic narratives will be discussed as we proceed. As to the second point, the doctrine of “three days,” John teaches that it referred to the raising up of what Jesus and the Jews called “this temple,” but that it meant “the temple of his body¹.” No doubt, this included (in the Evangelist’s judgment) the manifestation of Christ in the body to the disciples after death. But it certainly included also the rising up of Christ’s Body in the sense of the Church, the New Temple. In that connection, we should have to use the Philonian phrase again and say that the “three days” had “a timeless nature².”

¹ Jn ii. 19—21.

² On the difficulty of making any confident assertion about the number of Christ’s visits to the Temple, see *Introd.* pp. 90—6. John may have desired to impress on his readers, at the very outset of his Gospel, that Jesus regarded the Temple as being a Congregation of human beings, that is to say “sons of men,” built up on, and into, one ideal Son of Man, who was also Son of God. As John expounds the Doctrine of Bread before its chronological place, in connection with the Feeding of the Five Thousand, so he may have briefly expressed the Doctrine of the New Temple before its chronological place, in connection with what he believed to be Christ’s first public visit to the Temple.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 18. "Buying" or "Whence?"

In the texts printed below¹ the following are the most remarkable agreements and disagreements. (1) The four narratives of the Five Thousand speak of "buying," though in varying contexts. (2) The two narratives of the Four Thousand omit "buying" and ask "whence?" (3) John combines "buying" with "whence?" (4) Mark repeats "buying" twice ("that they may buy," "are we to buy?"). (5) Matthew has merely "that they may buy." (6) Luke has merely "unless we are to buy." (7) In the Synoptists, "buying" (or "whence")

¹ Mk vi. 35—7
(R.V.)

(35) And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto him, and said, The place is desert, and the day is now far spent:

(36) Send them away, that they may go (*ἀρελθόντες*) into the country and villages round about, and buy themselves somewhat to eat.

(37) But he answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go (*ἀρελθόντες*) and buy two hundred penny-worth of bread (*lit.* loaves), and give them to eat?

Mt. xiv. 15—16
(R.V.)

(15) And when even was come, the disciples came to him, saying, The place is desert, and the time is already past; send the multitudes away, that they may go (*ἀρελθόντες*) into the villages, and buy themselves food.

(16) But Jesus said unto them, They have no need to go away (*ἀρελθόντες*); give ye them to eat.

Lk. ix. 12—13
(R.V.)

(12) And the day began to wear away; and the twelve came, and said unto him, Send the multitude away, that they may go (*ἀρελθόντες*) into the villages and country round about, and lodge, and get (*ἐκποιήσω*) victuals: for we are here in a desert place.

(13) But he said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they said, We have no more than five loaves and two fishes; except we should go (*ἀρελθόντες*) and buy food for all this people.

Jn vi. 5—7

(5) Jesus therefore lifting up his eyes...saith unto Philip, Whence are we to buy bread (*lit.* loaves), that these may eat?

(6) Now this he said tempting (*or*, trying) him, for he himself knew what he purposed (*or*, was destined) (*ἐμελλε*) to do.

(7) Philip answered him, Two hundred penny-worth of bread (*lit.* loaves) is not sufficient for them, that each may take a little.

Lk. ix. 14 *a* adds here "For they were about five thousand men," which is parall. to Mk vi. 44, Mt. xiv. 21.

Mk viii. 4 (R.V.)

And his disciples answered him, Whence shall one be able to fill these men with bread (*lit.* loaves) here in a desert place?

Mt. xv. 33 (R.V.)

And the disciples say unto him, Whence should we have so many loaves in a desert place, as to fill so great a multitude?

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

is uttered by the disciples; in the Fourth Gospel, "*whence*" and "*buy*" are uttered by Jesus identifying Himself with the disciples ("*whence are we to buy?*").

In these passages, "*whence*" means "from what possible source," with an assumption that there is no possible source. "*Whence*," in any sense, is rare in LXX; but in this sense it does not occur more than thrice¹. The Pentateuch has but one instance. That occurs in a remonstrance of Moses, somewhat similar to the remonstrance of the disciples. Moses pleads that he cannot feed Israel in the wilderness. "*Whence to me flesh*," he asks, "to give to all this people?" "*Whence to me flesh?*" means, of course, "*Whence could I get flesh?*" But we might supply other verbs such as "*find*," or even "*buy*."

Moses adds "Shall flocks and herds be slain for them to *suffice* them? Or shall all the fish of the sea be gathered... to *suffice* them?" "*Suffice*"—a rare word both in LXX and in Gospels—occurs in the Johannine answer to the question "*Whence?*" asked by Jesus. "Two hundred pennyworth of loaves does not *suffice* for them," says Philip, "that each may take a little²." This combination of the rare words "*whence*" and "*suffice*," together with the similarity of circumstances, leads to the conclusion that John has in view, not only the Gospel traditions about the Feeding, but also the remonstrance of Moses. There is also a fair, though slighter, probability that the same remonstrance underlies the Mark-Matthew tradition.

¹ "*Whence?*" in "*Whence (πόθεν) comest thou?*" etc. occurs in Gen. xvi. 8, xxix. 4, etc. But, in the sense "from what possible source?" (implying "there is no possible source") it occurs (in A.V.) only in Numb. xi. 13, 2 K. vi. 27, Nahum iii. 7.

² Numb. xi. 13.

³ Numb. xi. 22, see below, p. 271, n. 3.

⁴ Jn vi. 7. 'Αρτίω occurs only eight or nine times in canon. LXX and four times in the Gospels.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

This hypothesis—of a brief original like that in Numbers "*Whence [should there accrue] to me flesh?*" or, still better, one in which "to me" was omitted—might explain the extraordinary Gospel variations as to "*buying*." No verb being in the original, evangelists would have to supply one—such as "*get*," "*find*," or "*buy*." Compare the Mark-Matthew "that they may *buy* food," parallel to the Lucan "that they may *find* provision (R.V. get victuals)." This may be illustrated from Proverbs "A scorner seeketh wisdom and [*doth*] *not* [*find* it]," where "*find*" is supplied by the LXX and English Versions¹.

In the Feeding of the Four Thousand, Mark's parallel to Matthew's (lit.) "*Whence to us so many loaves as to fill so great a multitude?*" is "*Whence shall one be* (SS *art thou*) *able to fill with loaves these men?*" This indicates that the original had no definite personal pronoun. Also the Syro-Sinaitic of Mark has "*find*" for "*be able*." These small links of verbal evidence connect the Gospel narratives both with one another and with that in Numbers which represents Moses as twice asking, in the Hebrew text, "*shall it be found for them?*"

From "*finding*" to "*buying*" is a transition of thought that may be illustrated from Job and Isaiah. Job asks "*Where shall wisdom be found?*" and proceeds to speak of "*the price*"

¹ Prov. xiv. 6. Comp. 1 S. xxvi. 18 (A.V.) "What evil [is] in my hand?" LXX *εὐρίσθῃ ἐν ἐμοί*, Job xii. 12 (A.V.) "With the ancient [is] wisdom," (A) *εὐρίσκειται*, Prov. v. 4 (Heb.) "Her end [is] bitter," LXX *εὐρήσεις*, i.e. "*thou wilt find it bitter*."

² In Mk viii. 4 *πῶθεν δύνησεται τις*, SS has literally "*Whence dost thou find [power]?*" *Thes. Syr.* 4147—8 shews that the radical meaning of the word is "*find*," and it is easy to see that "*I find [how] to do*" may mean "*I am able to do*."

³ Numb. xi. 22 (Heb.) "Shall flocks and herds be slain... and shall it be found (LXX *ἀπείρεσι*) for them... (rep.) and shall it be found (LXX *ἀπείρεσι*) for them?" i.e. "shall sufficient food be found for them?" No persons are indicated as the finders. See Genes. 593 b and 594 a indicating that the literal translation is "and so *one find* [enough] for them," i.e. shall it be found.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

as being beyond all silver, gold, and jewels¹. Isaiah says "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money, come ye, *buy* (*shābar*) and eat; yea, come, *buy* (*shābar*), without money and without price, wine and milk²." The word *shābar* is not often used for "*buy*." It means "*buy-corn*." Rashi, on Isaiah, says that it is used here as in the words "*to buy corn*"—alluding to the first Biblical use of the word in the description of "all countries" coming "into Egypt to Joseph *to buy-corn*³."

This allusion brings out the prophet's meaning: "Egypt sells its corn for a price. But God sells you His corn, the corn of heaven, the Law of Righteousness, without money and without price⁴." The Greek word used in the Gospels for "buying" is used by the LXX about the buying of corn in Genesis and about the buying of wine and milk in Isaiah. Consequently, in any Christian narrative that described the feeding of the multitudes by Christ in a form intended to symbolize the spiritual food of the Eucharist, it would be appropriate to use the word "*buy*" by way of contrast, in such a way as to make it clear that Christ's bread could *not* be "bought"—or, at all events, not bought in the ordinary sense of the word.

But the Synoptic Tradition does not make this clear. It speaks about the Five Thousand as (possibly) (Mark-Matthew)

¹ Job xxviii. 12—19.

² Is. lv. 1, Targ. "Come, hearken and learn, without price and without money, doctrine that is better than wine and milk."

³ Gen. xli. 56—7 contains the first Biblical instances of *shābar*. The causative means "*sell [corn]*" and the active "*buy [corn]*." A.V. "*sold* unto the Egyptians. . . all countries came. . . *to buy [corn]*." LXX *ἐπώλετ. . . ἀγοράζειν*.

⁴ Ibn Ezra, on Is. lv. 1, says that wine and milk "serve both for food and drink." He seems to anticipate the objection that *shābar* ought not to be applied except to that which is eaten. Rashi, on Genesis, says (if the text is genuine) "You must not say that *shābar* is used only of corn, for it is used also of *wine* and *milk* (Is. lv. 1)."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"going away and buying" or (Luke) "going and finding," and also about the impossibility that the disciples should (Mark) "go away and buy" or (Luke) "go and buy¹"; but it so distracts us with verbal variations that we are in danger of learning nothing from the words². "They were uttered by the disciples," we may say, "not by Jesus, and the disciples were in the dark, and did not know what they were speaking about."

John, without denying that the disciples used these expressions about "*buying*," and also about the impossibility of finding "*whence*" they might procure food in any way, declares that Jesus Himself used expressions of this nature, and that He did it in a kindly and gentle (we may almost say playful) spirit, "*tempting (or, trying)*" Philip. The Evangelist's view is that Jesus had reasons for choosing this particular disciple—a little slow perhaps, but sure and straightforward—in order to lead him, and through him the rest of the Apostles, towards a higher stage of revelation. It was not the highest but only a higher. "He himself"—John says, in a kind of aside—"knew what he would do," but He did not at present say "what he would do." He merely prepared Philip for expecting at once, and for receiving later on, some mystical

¹ "Going away" = ἀπελθόντες. "Going" = πορευθέντες. R.V. makes no distinction here, though rendering the infin. ἀπελθεῖν "go away" in Mt. xiv. 16.

² The key to the original is perhaps to be found in the deliberative subjunctive ἀγοράσωμεν, found in Mk, Lk., and Jn, and meaning "ought we, or, are we, or, we are, to buy." "Ought" is expressed in Heb. by (1) the future ("Thou shalt, i.e. *oughtest to*, do"), (2) the infin. after "it is" ("It is [*fit*] to do," "it is [*fit*] for thee to do"). Confusion might arise between "Is it [*fit*] to go away and buy?" and "It is [*fit*] to go away and buy." The former would be taken as "Is it [*fit*] for us [i.e. the disciples]?" the latter, as "It is [*fit*] for them [i.e. the five thousand]." See *Oxf. Conc.* LXX δεῖν, and e.g. Ezek. xxxiv. 2 Heb. "Shall [i.e. should] they not feed?" LXX οὐ βόσκουσιν (interrogative). The ambiguity might be increased by two datives "[fit] for us to buy for them."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

doctrine about the spiritual Bread. "He himself knew what he would do" means "He knew what He was destined to do on the Cross, buying the Bread of Life for the world at the cost of His blood¹."

§ 19. "Two hundred pennyworth," in Mark and John²

Why was this precise sum mentioned by the disciples, or recorded by Mark to have been mentioned by them? Why did Matthew and Luke omit Mark's tradition? Why did John insert it? The question here is, not *whether* John intervenes for Mark, but *why* he intervenes.

"Two hundred pence (*or*, denars)" is a sum frequently specified in Talmudic enactments about fines, damages, marriage portions, etc.³ Also, if a man had an income of less than two hundred denars, he could claim certain exemptions and allowances. It was legally recognised as being, so to speak,

¹ For this mystical meaning of the word "buy," ἀγοράζω, John has previously prepared the way by representing the disciples (Jn iv. 8, 32) as leaving their Master alone and going "to buy" food in Sychar (which He rejects, telling them that He has food to eat that they know not of). The third and last instance of ἀγοράζω is where Judas Iscariot, going forth to betray the Master whom he has sold, is regarded by some of the disciples (Jn xiii. 29) as being instructed by Jesus to "buy" something needed for "the feast [of the Passover]." For Jn vi. 6 "destined (ἐμελλε) to do," see *Son* 3402a.

But what are we to say as to the plural "*loaves*" ("whence are we to buy *loaves*?") assigned by John to Jesus here and nowhere else except in the reproach (Jn vi. 26) "ye ate of the *loaves*"? Does the Evangelist represent Jesus as speaking, as it were, down to the level of Philip, about the rudimentary food to be provided on this occasion? If so, we may illustrate from the plural (Jn iv. 8) "buy *food(s)* (τροφάς)," unique in N.T., where the "foods" are called by Origen *ad loc.* "suitable foods (τροφάς) with the heterodox (παρὰ τοῖς ἑτεροδόξοις)," and Ammonius (*ad loc.* Cramer p. 216) sees a warning against "various foods of luxury (ἰδεσμάτων)." Τροφαί is used of "forbidden foods" in 4 Macc. i. 33, iv. 26 (comp. 3 Macc. iii. 7).

² Mk vi. 37, Jn vi. 7.

³ See *Hor. Heb.* on Mk vi. 37. Wetstein is silent.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"a poor man's income¹." Christ's disciples were poor men. Hence, when exhorted by Jesus to give bread to the multitude, one of them might be supposed to reply "Even if we had the whole of our year's income in our hands, should we go away and spend it all in a single meal—and that, too, insufficient—for this multitude?"

Thus explained, the Marcan tradition becomes intelligible. But, outside Palestine, who would know the explanation? Moreover, even with this explanation, it is not clear, because Mark at this stage has not yet told us the number of the multitude, and does not mention it till the very end of the narrative². This omission may be contrasted with the orderly insertion in the O.T. narrative of the meal given by Elisha to the sons of the prophets. Elisha's servant, receiving "*twenty loaves of barley*," says at once, "What! Shall I set this before *an hundred men*³?" Similarly Luke, in his parallel to Mark, lets us know at once the number of the multitude thus "Unless we are to go and buy food for all this people—for *they were about five thousand men*⁴." Without this knowledge, the inadequacy of two hundred denarii is by no means obvious. For a denarius was a labourer's daily wage⁵ and could presumably suffice for one simple meal for several labourers. Two hundred denarii might therefore well provide for a single meal for a considerable number, quite large enough to be called a "multitude."

Again, "two hundred denarii" might possibly imply *gold*

¹ *J. Pea* viii. 8 (Mishna) and *Sota* 21 b. *Hor. Heb.* omits this. So also does Schlatter on Jn vi. 7.

² Mk vi. 44.

³ *Hor. Heb.* on Jn vi. 9 refers to 2 K. iv. 42 and *Chetub.* 105. 2, 106. 9, where "the masters enhance the number of men fed by Elisha to two thousand two hundred" from the Scriptural "one hundred."

⁴ Comp. Numb. xi. 13 "Whence should I have flesh to give to *all this people*?" *ib.* 21—2 "The people...are *six hundred thousand*...shall flocks and herds be slain for them to suffice them..."

⁵ Mt. xx. 2—13.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

denarii. In that case—since a gold denarius was worth twenty-five silver denarii—the sum would amount to five thousand silver denarii, that is to say, the daily wage for five thousand men¹. Then the meaning of the expostulating disciples would be “Are we [so rich that we are] to go and buy bread for two hundred [gold] denarii and to give them to eat [a meal worth a day’s wage for each man]?”

This is an improbable supposition. For “denarii,” without the epithet “gold,” would be taken by all to mean “silver denarii.” But difficulties like these may explain, not only why Matthew and Luke omitted Mark’s tradition about the denarii, but also why Matthew modified the context by transferring “go away” from the disciples to the multitude (“they have no need to go away”), as indicated above², and why Luke inserted at this stage the number of the multitude³.

John retains Mark’s “two hundred pence,” but assigns the expression to Philip instead of to the disciples collectively. He does not follow Luke in inserting the number of the multitude

¹ See *Son* 3420 g referring to *Levy* i. 399 b. Wagenseil’s *Sola* p. 552 has an obscure remark about a dower of 200 denarii “ut ita ducenti isti denarii efficient omnino (?) xxv denarios argenteos, quorum cujusque pondus xxvi grana hordacea.” If “each” were written for “altogether (omnino),” this would seem to be a confused statement about denarii of gold, as being each worth twenty-five denarii of silver. The mention of a grain of barley as a standard of weight for denarii is perhaps worth noting, in view of the *Johannine* mention of denarii and barley loaves in the same context.

² See p. 269, comp. p. 273, n. 2.

³ Another possible cause of corruption can be but briefly indicated. In Greek, the sign of “5000” is ,Ϟ and the sign of “200” is C’, and Ϟ and C are frequently confused. Schlatter (on *Jn* vi. 7) quotes *Siph.* Deut. 355 “Oil for (Ϟ) a hundred myriads do I need”—where Ϟ seems to mean “for the sake of,” somewhat like *Gen.* xviii. 28 (*Gesen.* 90 b) “on account of five,” but it usually means “at the price of.” Perhaps “for 200 denarii,” in Greek, when “denarii” was denoted by a sign, might be confused with “for five thousand [men].” Or ἀγοράσωμεν θηναρίων with C’ might be corrupted into ἀγοράσωμεν διὰ ἀνδρῶν with ,Ϟ.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

here to shew the inadequacy of the sum. But he represents Philip as saying that it would be quite inadequate. As to the "pence," he makes no effort to shew what may have been in Philip's mind, but he seems to suggest, as being in Christ's mind, a very different kind of "buying"—namely, what might be called a "ransoming" of the souls of men at a price above visible "denarii."

The first Biblical mention of "ransoming" the "soul" occurs in connection with the numbering of the Israelites. They are to give "every man a ransom for his soul¹." The Law proceeds "*This* shall they give...half a shekel." The Jerusalem Targum explains "*this*" by adding "This valuation was shewn to Moses in the mountain as with a *denarius* of fire²." In one of the many forms in which this tradition is repeated, it is said that God's words so terrified Moses that he replied "Who can give a ransom for his soul?" It was then (said R. Meir) that God shewed Moses a coin of fire and said "*This* shalt thou give³."

The three Synoptists agree that on one memorable occasion Jesus called for a denarius and said to the Pharisees "Whose is this image and inscription⁴?" To this they replied "Caesar's." He then bade them give "to Caesar that which is Caesar's." Presumably that which was "*Caesar's*" meant the denarius. And it was "*Caesar's*" because it was stamped

¹ Exod. xxx. 12. In Exod. xxi. 30 (A.V.) "*ransom* of his life (*lit.* soul)," R.V. has "*redemption*" (see context).

² Similarly Rashi says "God shewed Moses a coin of fire of which the weight was half a shekel, and said, *This* (istiusmodi) shall the Israelites give."

³ See Numb. r. Wû. pp. 275—6, also *Pesikt.* (Piska II) Wû. pp. 10—21, and *ib.* Wû. p. 76. In some forms of the tradition, it is explained that "*this*" means "Not what thou didst suppose but what I shew thee," or that the coin was under the throne of God. In *Pesikt.* p. 76, one tradition says that the coin is the sacrificial lamb of Numb. xxviii. 3.

⁴ Mk xii. 16 foll., Mt. xxii. 18 foll., Lk. xx. 24.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

with Caesar's image and name. But, if so, what is the meaning of "God's" in the following words, "And to God that which is "God's"? Does it imply merely this, "If you give the Roman denarius to pay tribute to Caesar, you are equally bound to give the Jewish shekel—that is, the temple shekel, the shekel with its sacred symbols stamped upon it—to God"?

That is, at first sight, an attractive explanation because it is so simple, and lays down so definite a rule. But, on second thoughts, does it seem like Jesus to lay down definite rules (except in hyperbole such as "turning the cheek" and "walking two miles") without regard to motive? Does not Christ's phrase, "that which is God's," imply a heavenly denarius, so to speak, stamped with God's image and name? And what is this stamp but the impress of the Spirit of the divine Love? This love best represents the divine nature in its relation to men. This love God gives to men that they may pay it back to Him, thereby ransoming themselves from selfishness and sin, and making themselves free for a life of sonship toward the Father in heaven and of brotherhood toward His children on earth.

The Jews, in many of their comments on the "ransom of a man's soul," or on other texts that speak of the soul's "ransom," say, or imply, that the ransom is "almsgiving," which they call technically "righteousness¹." Sometimes they are careful to add that such almsgiving must be disinterested, or at all events not ostentatious; but frequently they use unguarded hyperbole, such as that "*a farthing given to a poor man bestows on the giver a vision of the Shechinah*," and that "I shall behold thy face in righteousness," in the Psalms, means "I shall behold thy face" after the Resurrection "*because*

¹ Prov. xiii. 8 "The ransom of a man's soul is his riches" is often associated with Exod. xxx. 12—13, and is explained by Rashi as being true "because he *distributes alms*" from his riches.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

of *alms*¹." Against the identification of "righteousness" with "alms"—which resembles the occasional identification of "charity" with "alms" in modern English—Jesus vehemently protested. But He did not deny, and indeed He emphasized, the helpful and purifying influence of singlehearted almsgiving. Alms rightly given on earth (He taught) reproduced themselves in heaven, so that the perishable coin from "the treasure on earth" procured for the giver an eternal "treasure in heaven²."

It is only the Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke that speaks thus of this "treasure in heaven." And there the context contains no mention or implication of the negative aspect, "ransoming," but only of the positive aspect, reward. But both aspects are hinted at in the Threefold Tradition about the rich young ruler to whom Jesus says "Sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have *treasure in heaven*³." According to Matthew, the man needed to be ransomed from himself. He was so fettered in self-satisfaction that he believed he had fulfilled not only the commands of the Decalogue but also the precept "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself⁴." He seems to have been what the Pastoral

¹ See *Bab. Bathr.* 10 a, and *Tehill.* on Ps. xvii. 15, where Rashi, however, does not thus limit righteousness. Comp. *Hor. Heb.* (on Mt. vi. 1) "They called alms by the name of righteousness," and the passages there alleged to prove this. See also the Heb. of Sir. iii. 30, and xl. 24. In the latter, the editors give an alternative, "*righteousness* (or, *almsgiving*) delivereth above them both."

² Comp. Mt. vi. 20 "treasure up treasures . . .," parall. to Lk. xii. 33 "Make to yourselves purses that wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not." To this Luke (but not Matthew) prefixes "Sell your goods and give alms."

³ Mk x. 21 on which see *Beginning* p. 263. There it is pointed out that Mark may have confused "*deceived himself*," ΗΠΑΘΗCΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ, with "*loved him*," ΗΓΑΠΗCΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ, or that Hebrew confusion may have produced the false impression that Jesus "*loved him*."

⁴ Mt. xix. 19.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Epistles call "a lover of self" as well as "a lover of money¹." If Jesus perceived that he was "in love with himself²," we can understand why He imposed on him a condition that He knew the man would fail to fulfil. Through the failure the man would be at least benefited at once to the extent of having his self-love disturbed. Hereafter, he might attain to the vision of the true love, the denarius of fire, the ransom of the soul.

The "denarius" will come before us again when we discuss the Anointing at Bethany, where Mark—again followed by John, but not by Matthew—mentions "three hundred denarii" as the price of the ointment³. The above-mentioned "denar" of the Jerusalem Targum is also latent in Matthew's description of the *stater*, i.e. "*shekel*," taken by Peter from a fish's mouth in order to satisfy the claims of the collectors of the *didrachm*, i.e. "half-shekel⁴." That narrative, whatever may be the full explanation of its details, adds to the cumulative evidence that metaphors or allegories based upon the payment of coin as a "ransom for the soul" would be prominent in the doctrine of early Evangelists, and that literal statements made about denarii in Mark would be allegorized by John. Such allegorizing is comparatively rare in the Talmud, but frequent in the Midrash and poetic Targums, which may often throw light on the imagery underlying Christ's doctrine. In the present instance, quite apart from its value as an exemplification of Johannine Intervention, John's retention of the Marcan "denarii"—taken with the new Johannine context, which

¹ 2 Tim. iii. 2 φιλαυτοί, φιλάργυροι.

² I have not found an instance of ἀγαπᾶν ἑαυτὸν though φιλεῖν ἑαυτὸν is very common. But Mark might use ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν, "he was in love with himself," to denote an excess of the habit expressed by φιλεῖν.

³ Mk xiv. 5.

⁴ Mt. xvii. 24—27 A.V. "tribute [money]...a piece of money," R.V. "the half-shekel...a shekel," W.H. τὰ διδραχμα...στατήρα. On this, and on Philo's allegorizing of "the half of the shekel," which LXX calls "the half of the didrachm," see *Notes* 2900 (x).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

allows us to regard it as part of a reply to a mystical utterance of Christ about "buying"—appears to accord with the Johanne doctrine that God is Love. Man, God's coin, restamped by the redeeming Son of Man with the divine image that has been wellnigh obliterated by sin, is to present himself wholly, in the Spirit of Sonship, to the Father. This sacrifice, and not the partial and formal sacrifice of almsgiving, constitutes the real and spiritual ransom by which the sinner is redeemed from his lower self¹.

If we reject the view that John gave a mystical application to the Marcan "two hundred denarii," what other view are we prepared to take of his retention of it? Are we to say that he retained it simply because it was in Mark, and because he saw no reason why Matthew and Luke should reject it? In that case, we must suppose him to have argued to this effect: "It is desirable to retain as much of Mark's detail as possible. I do not explain what was Mark's reason for mentioning this precise sum, but I am able to add that it was *not* (as Mark supposes) 'the disciples' that mentioned it. It was only Philip."

This would suggest that Philip's utterances were not held in much account by the Evangelist. But is that so? Philip loves the concrete and substantial, perhaps. When Nathanael argues, in the abstract, that no one can be the Messiah if he is from Nazareth, Philip appeals to the concrete and substantial: "Come"—that is, "come to Jesus"—and "see²." When Jesus speaks spiritually about "seeing" the Father, Philip

¹ At the same time the Fourth Gospel contains evidence shewing that its author felt the metaphors of "ransoming" and "buying" to be inadequate, and desired to supplement them by another metaphor or (x. 6) "proverb," in which the Good Shepherd is described as rescuing His sheep from the Wolf at the cost of His life—yet not by ransoming, but by conquering. See *Son*, Index "Ransom."

² Jn i. 46.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

asks for a substantial object of vision, "Shew us the Father¹." Nevertheless it is to Philip that Providence directs the Greeks to come, saying "We would see Jesus²." And it is Philip's materialistic utterance, "Shew us the Father," that draws forth from Jesus the words "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." The Evangelist seems to suggest that this particular Apostle, even though he did not "see" things like a Rabbi or a Philosopher, was more than once made the instrument of Providence for helping others to "see" things as they are. For that reason (it would seem) Jesus "tempts" him—not for Philip's harm but for the world's good. He was worth "tempting." It was destined that through Philip's reply to Christ's question "*Whence are we to buy?*" the world should be led to reflect on the paradoxical nature of that purchase-money with which the Son of God was to buy for them the unpurchasable Bread³.

¹ Jn xiv. 8. Comp. Exod. xxiv. 10 "and they saw the God of Israel."

² Jn xii. 21.

³ Some may reply "Philip and Andrew are mere *dramatis personae* introduced by the Fourth Evangelist, here as elsewhere, in order to present his own thoughts about Jesus in a dramatic setting." But note what Papias says about the pains that he took to inquire not so much about books as about sayings, and in particular (Euseb. iii. 39. 4) "what had been said by *Andrew* or what by *Peter*, or what by *Philip*, or what by *Thomas*...." Is it not very rash to deny that in the Evangelist's days there were current many things alleged to have been "said by *Andrew*, *Philip*, and *Thomas*," not contained in the Synoptic Gospels, and that he made it part of his business to find a place for them in his Gospel wherever they illustrated the Teaching of Christ? No one disputes that Papias did this. Why should we deny the possibility that the Fourth Evangelist did the same thing?

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 20. "*How many loaves have ye? Go [and] see,*" in Mark¹

These words are in Mark alone. Their omission by Matthew and Luke may be explained by the difficulty of giving them

¹ Mk vi 37—38
(R.V.)

(37) But he answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread (*lit.* loaves), and give them to eat?

(38) And he saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? Go [and] see. And when they knew (*γινώσκοντες*), they say, Five, and two fishes.

Mt. xiv. 16—18
(R.V.)

(16) But Jesus said unto them, They have no need to go away; give ye them to eat.

(17) And they say unto him, We have here but five loaves, and two fishes.

(18) And he said, Bring them hither to me.

Lk. ix. 13—14a
(R.V.)

(13) But he said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they said, We have no more than five loaves and two fishes; except we should go and buy food for all this people.

(14a) For they were about five thousand men.

Jn vi. 5—9
(R.V.)

(5) Jesus therefore...saith unto Philip, Whence are we to buy bread (*lit.* loaves), that these may eat?

(6) And this he said to(?) prove him; for he himself knew what he would do.

(7) Philip answered him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread (*lit.* loaves) is not sufficient for them, that every one may take a little.

(8) One of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto him,

(9) There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves, and two fishes: but what are these among so many?

Mk viii. 2 b—5 (R.V.)

they...have nothing to eat:

(3) And if I send them away fasting to their home, they will faint in the way; and some of them are come from far.

(4) And his disciples answered him, Whence shall one be able to fill these men with bread (*lit.* loaves) here in a desert place?

(5) And he asked them, How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven.

Mt. xv. 32 b—34 (R.V.)

they...have nothing to eat: and I would not send them away fasting, lest haply they faint in the way.

(33) And the disciples say unto him, Whence should we have so many loaves in a desert place, as to fill so great a multitude?

(34) And Jesus saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven, and a few small fishes.

For the purpose of clearness, texts partially given above are repeated here. It will be noted that the six accounts all begin with some words of Jesus about the giving of food, or the need of food,

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

any sense that seems in harmony with the narrative of a stupendous miracle. They seem to imply that Jesus was at some distance from the little store of food carried by the disciples. Finding them ignorant of its amount He sends them away to ascertain it. "Having ascertained it"¹—for that is what the Greek means—they report "five, and two fishes." All this is very simple. But is it not too simple? Why record it? Matthew and Luke—possibly because it is too simple—do not record it. They represent the disciples as replying at once to Christ's "Give ye them to eat"—without any mention or indication of an interval—that they have only "five loaves and two fishes." In the miracle of the Four Thousand, there is the same absence of interval—"How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven...."

John differs from all the Synoptists in that he does not represent Jesus as saying to the disciples "Give ye them to eat." On the contrary, Jesus says to Philip "Whence are we to buy loaves that these may eat?" It is added "This he said tempting (*or, trying*) him, for he himself knew what he would do." This seems to imply "He knew that, in truth, He did not purpose to buy loaves; He intended to prepare Philip to learn a lesson about *bread that could not be bought*." But on the other hand it might imply "He knew what Philip would say about denarii, and He purposed to teach Philip a lesson about *bread that could indeed be bought*—only for a very different price, the invisible 'denarius' of Redemption." In either case we are made to feel that we must look below the surface for some allusive meaning, indicating the doctrine of sacrifice, that is, of "buying," or "redeeming." Philip is to be taught this by being "*tried*" or "*tempted*." The Evangelist has probably some latent meaning in this mention of "tempting."

for the multitude to "eat." But John connects his mention of "loaves that these may eat" with "buying"—as a prospective act for Jesus and the disciples ("are we to buy?").

¹ Mk vi. 38 *γινώσκεις*, on which see *Proclam.* p. 268 n.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

He never uses the word again. In N.T. it mostly implies the malignity of an adversary—and especially the Adversary called Satan—who tries us that we may fall. And though the Synoptists use it abundantly, and often of Jesus being tempted, they never describe Jesus as tempting others.

These considerations lead us to the story of God's "tempting" Abraham before the sacrifice of Isaac on Mount Moriah—the first Biblical instance of the word "tempt," and the only one in the whole of Genesis¹. We have seen above, in the Johannine description of Jesus as "lifting up his eyes and beholding a great multitude coming to him," an allusion to Abraham seeing the vision of the Seed of the Promise. Here it should be added that "lift up the eyes" is applied to the Patriarch when he hospitably entertains the Three, who come to make the Promise². In the Dialogue that follows the Feeding of the Five Thousand in the Fourth Gospel, Jews speak of the Giving of the Manna³; and Jewish Christians in the first century could not but connect the Manna with the Loaves and Fishes, both in comparison and in contrast. Now it was a

¹ Gen. xxii. 1 *ἐπειράσεν*. The Heb. is נִסָּה, which also occurs in Syr. and Palest. of Jn vi. 6, and in Delitzsch's Hebrew. This must be distinguished from δοκιμάζω, "test," "prove," which mostly = נִסָּה in LXX, but never נִסָּה. There is perhaps a touch of irony when Paul tells the Corinthians—who "seek a *proof* (δοκιμή)" of the Christ that "speaks in" him—that they had better "*tempt*, or *make trial of*" themselves (2 Cor. xiii. 5) "*Make-trial-of* (πειράζεσθε) yourselves whether ye are in the faith, *prove* (δοκιμάζεσθε) yourselves." Πειράζω, applied to persons in N.T., almost always means trial proceeding from adversaries, and Rev. ii. 2 *ἐπείρασας τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους* is hardly an exception. But John perhaps felt that, if he had used δοκιμάζω, as in 1 Jn iv. 1 "*prove* (δοκιμάζεσθε) the spirits whether they be of God," he would have misled his readers. Jesus did not wish to "*prove*" Philip to see "whether" he would answer this or that; He wished to "*tempt*" him, as God "*tempted*" Abraham, as a preparation for a blessing that was to follow.

² Gen. xviii. 2 "He lifted up his eyes, and looked, and lo...."

³ Jn vi. 31 foll.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

recognised tradition among the Jews that whatever hospitality Abraham gave to the Three, God gave to the Israelites in the wilderness: "R. Jehudah said in the name of Rab: All that Abraham did for the angels by himself, the Holy One, blessed be He, did for his children by Himself; and what Abraham did for them through a messenger, the Holy One did the same for his children through a messenger¹." What "messenger" is here meant? And is there anything in any of the Gospel narratives of Christ's miracles of feeding that includes something corresponding to Abraham's "messenger"? This will be considered in the next section, in the hope that it may throw some light on the Marcan tradition, at present unexplained, "Go [*and*] see."

§ 21. "There is a *lad* here," in John²

In the five Synoptic accounts of feeding it is stated by the disciples, or assumed by Jesus, that the loaves belong to the disciples ("we have no more than," "how many have ye?"). The Fourth Gospel alone, after Christ's question "How shall we buy bread?" and after Philip's reply about the insufficiency of two hundred pennyworth, represents Andrew as saying "There is a *lad* (*paidarion*) here that has five barley loaves and two fishes." About this Chrysostom says, "I think that he [*i.e.* Andrew] did not say this in simple ignorance, but because he had heard the wonders of the prophets and how Elisha worked the sign over the loaves³." The loaves brought to Elisha were an offering from a stranger; and Chrysostom seems

¹ *B. Metsia* 86 b. The context enters into detail, *e.g.* "Abraham's "butter" and "milk" are rewarded with "manna." Comp. *Numb. v.* on *Numb. vii.* 48 (*Wü.* p. 348) sect. 14, repeating the same doctrine of the reward of Abraham's hospitality.

² *Jn* vi. 9.

³ Chrys. on *Jn* vi. 9, referring to 2 *K.* iv. 42 "And there came a man...and brought the man of God bread of the firstfruits, twenty loaves of barley...."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

to assume that the loaves of the "lad" came also from some stranger, that is to say, they did not belong to the disciples or to any "lad" in their service. And this is the natural interpretation of the words in John.

It is not unlikely that John was influenced by the miracle of Elisha and the barley loaves, in conjunction with other causes. But the first cause might be Hebrew corruption. The first Biblical mention of "barley" in LXX arises from a misreading of a word meaning "measure" or "estimation".¹ "*Loaves estimated* at two hundred denarii" might be confused with "*loaves of barley* for two hundred denarii." Thus a tradition might arise about the loaves that they were "*loaves of barley*." This might naturally be added to the story, partly in view of Elisha's miraculous multiplication of barley loaves, and partly because "barley loaves" might seem to accord with the time of the year², and also with a symbolic application of Christ's act. But this hypothesis does not explain John's introduction of the word "*lad*," *paidarion*. For that is not used in the story of Elisha³. Moreover *paidarion* occurs nowhere else in N.T. and (with one exception) nowhere in Christian writers of the first century and a half⁴. We are therefore led to ask, outside Greek writings, for something corresponding to the Johannine *paidarion* in Hebrew Scripture, or in Jewish traditions about Scripture.

Now, *paidarion* in LXX regularly corresponds to a Hebrew word frequently rendered in Genesis "lad".⁵ And the first Biblical mention of the Hebrew word corresponding to "*lad*"

¹ See *Son* 3420 f—g, quoting Gen. xxvi. 12.

² Jn vi. 4 "the passover was nigh" (see above, p. 246).

³ 2 K. iv. 43 (A.V.) "his servitor" is explained (Gesen. 1058 a) as Elisha's "chief servant," LXX λειτουργός, superior to παιδάριον.

⁴ Goodspeed gives it as occurring only in *Polyc. Mari.* §§ 6—7, where it refers to two servants of Polycarp, one of whom, under torture, betrays his master's hiding place.

⁵ In A.V., "lad" sing. = נָעַר, *naar*, 17 times in Genesis (but not again till Judg. xvi. 26) and 12 times in 1 Samuel.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

is in the story of Abraham's hospitality to the Three Persons: "And Abraham ran unto the herd and fetched a calf...and gave it unto *the lad*, and he hasted to dress it¹." Here A.V. has "*a young man*," and R.V. "*the servant*." But the exact rendering is "*the lad [in attendance]*," "*the young [servant]*." It might be applied to "the youthful [son of the house]" if the context suited such an application, and accordingly some Jewish authorities interpret it here as Ishmael². The LXX does not here render the word by *paidarion*, but that is its regular rendering of the word³. The "lad" mentioned in the story about Abraham's hospitality appears to be the person contemplated by R. Jehudah in the words above quoted "What Abraham did [for the Three] through a *messenger*, the Holy One did the same for his children through a *messenger*⁴."

The title of "messenger" or "apostle" would seem here to apply to Moses. Through him God gave the manna to Israel; and it has been shewn that Moses and Aaron are called God's "*apostles*" or "*messengers*⁵." It is said about Moses in the cradle, according to our English versions, that the daughter of Pharaoh "*saw the child* and behold *the babe* wept⁶." But the Hebrew text has, for "*babe*," the word regularly corresponding to *paidarion*; and Rashi seems to render it by "*lad*," expressly saying "His voice was deep (*gravis*) like that of a *lad* (*pueri*), not like that of a very little infant (*parvuli infantis*)"—apparently attaching a mystical or prophetic significance to

¹ Gen. xviii. 7 LXX τῷ παῖδι.

² So Gen. v. and Rashi (on Gen. xviii. 7), and *Aboth R. Nathan* (on *Aboth* i. 16).

³ Heb. נָעַר = (Tromm.) παιδάριον about 140 times, παιδίον (23), παῖς (14), νεανίσκος (21), νεώτερος (10), νέος (7) etc.

⁴ See p. 286.

⁵ See *Proclam.* p. 392, quoting Jerem. ii. 2 (Targ.) "my two apostles Moses and Aaron in the wilderness."

⁶ Exod. ii. 6 (A.V. and R.V.) "child" = יֶלֶד, "babe" = נָעַר, LXX ὁρῶν παιδίον κλαῖον, merging the two words in one.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the fact that the babe Moses in his cradle (like the babe Herakles in Greek story) was already more than an infant¹.

All this, however, though it may explain John's application of the tradition about the "lad" when it had arisen, does not explain how it arose. If such a "lad" existed, why was the fact omitted by the Synoptists? If there was not, how came John to suppose his existence²? To these questions there is at present no answer based on definite evidence. But there are reasonable (though conjectural) answers—derived from what we know about Mark and John in general, and about these Marcan and Johannine narratives in particular—namely, that John is attempting to explain Mark's "*Go, see.*"

One explanation may be conjecturally given to the following effect: "The disciples had no food of their own at hand. But, as Jesus bade them '*go*' and '*see*,' they '*went*' and '*saw*.' They found some one with five loaves and two fishes. These they brought to Jesus saying that they had no more. In reality, they had not even these. But as the owner was willing to give them, they brought them as their own. All this is obscurely suggested in the Marcan '*Go, see.*' and is altogether omitted by Matthew and Luke. But in fact this stranger with the 'five loaves and two fishes' whom the disciples '*went*' and '*saw*,' may have been a person not to be left out. He may have been

¹ See *Numb. i.* (on *Numb. iii. 14*, Wü. p. 42) quoting *Exod. ii. 6* and *ib. 23* and saying that the "sighing" of Israel and the "weeping" of Moses in the cradle were the preparation of the nation for fulfilling the purpose of God. On *Zech. ii. 4* (8) "*this young man*," Kimchi, who assumes the prophet to be meant, says that he is so called, either as being literally "young" (like Jeremiah) or as being subordinate to a superior as Joshua was to Moses (*Exod. xxxiii. 11* "*Joshua the son of Nun a young man*").

² To a third question, "If there was not, how came John to invent it?" my reply would be that repeated investigations in previous parts of *Diatessarica* have shewn that John does not "invent"—though he may have received visions that some would call "inventions." This tradition may have been one of "the sayings of Andrew" inquired into by Papias (s. above, p. 282, n. 3).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

like the stranger in Genesis ('a certain man') who met Joseph wandering in the field and said to him 'What seekest thou¹?' That 'man,' they say, was Gabriel. But Gabriel would not be appropriate here. For in this action the Lord is recompensing to Abraham's children the hospitality that He Himself received from Abraham, in which Abraham was helped, not by a 'man' but by a '*lad*.' Let us say, then, that this unknown stranger was a '*lad*.' And as the '*lad*' assisted Abraham in preparing food for the Lord, so let us now see a '*lad*' assisting the Lord in preparing food for Abraham's descendants. The '*lad*' then received 'a calf' from Abraham and 'prepared' it. The '*lad*' now gives 'five loaves and two fishes' to the Lord Jesus, and He prepares them by letting them pass through His hands as He distributes the food to all the people. This '*lad*' was Moses, who wrote the five books of the Law, containing also songs and predictions². As the five loaves are symbolic of the Law, so the fishes might be symbolic of psalms and prophecies, whether called 'a few,' or, as some might say, 'two fishes,' that is, 'the Psalms and the Prophets' considered as two books. This was the food that Moses, the servant of God, offered to the Messiah, the Son of God, who distributed it to the people. And as Joshua, the first Jesus, is called a

¹ Gen. xxxvii. 15, on which see *Joh. Gr.* 2649 b.

² Jerome, on Mt. xiv. 17, says "In another Evangelist we read (Jn vi. 9) *There is a lad here who has five loaves*—who seems to me to signify Moses." The text continues: "Duos autem pisces vel utrumque intelligimus Testamentum, vel quia par numerus refertur ad legem." But one MS adds "*et prophetas*," which seems necessary to the sense ("the even number refers to the Law and the Prophets"). Later on he says: "*The Law with the Prophets* is broken and divided into fragments (in frusta discerpitur) and its mysteries are brought forth to view, so that what did not nourish, as long as it was whole and abiding in its pristine state, might, by being divided into parts, nourish the multitude of the Gentiles (gentium)."

Origen, on Mt. xiv. 17, says that "perhaps" the five loaves contained a veiled reference to "the sensible (*αἰσθητοὺς*) words of the Scriptures corresponding in number on this account to the five senses," and the two fishes to the λόγος προφητικός and the λόγος

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

'lad' when ministering to Moses¹, so is Moses himself called a 'lad' when ministering to the second Jesus."

The second explanation, though similar to the first in detail, would differ in this respect, that it would base itself in part on apostolic tradition. It would go back to one of those "sayings of Andrew" about which Papias tells us that he used to make inquiry, something to this effect:—"Andrew, the Apostle, said (*or*, used to say) that *the Five Loaves and the Two Fishes did not appertain to the Twelve, but to a Servant* [meaning Moses]. Also Andrew said (*or*, used to say)—speaking of the Law and the Prophets in themselves and before they were broken up like bread and expounded by the Lord—'*What could they avail for the multitudes [seeking the Bread of Life]*?'"

The second of these explanations seems to me decidedly more probable than the first; but if either of them is even partially correct we find ourselves in an atmosphere of

ἐνδιαφέρον ("which are a relish, so to speak, to the sensible things contained in the Scriptures") or, perhaps, to the word that had "already come (*φθίσαντα*)" to the disciples "about the Father and the Son"; but he adds that others may be able to give a fuller and better interpretation.

Clement of Alexandria 665—6, while implying that the "five pillars" of Exod. xxvi. 37 are less sacred than the "four pillars" of Exod. xxvi. 32, simply mentions "the five loaves" in connection with "the things of sense."

Thus, the further back we go, the less proof we find that "five" was regarded by Greek commentators as referring to the five books of the Law. They may be wrong. They may have failed to catch the poetic allusions of the Galilaean tradition. But still we have to keep our minds open to the possibility that "five" may have originally had some other reference (*s.g.* meaning "a few") and that the explanation of the "five loaves" as the five books of the Law came later. It certainly is not entirely satisfactory, because it is difficult to find a corresponding explanation of the "two fishes."

¹ Exod. xxxiii. 11 "His [*i.e.* Moses's] minister Joshua, the son of Nun, a *lad*," R.V. "*a young man*." Perhaps the Heb. *naar* is intended to convey the double notion of youth and service.

² On the ambiguous "said" or "used to say"—ambiguous in Hebrew as well as in Greek (*ἔλεγε*), see *Joh. Gr.* 2470 a.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Jewish symbolism and mystical tradition through which we must look at the whole of the context. It is easy to realise this about the "two hundred denarii" discussed above. But the reader may feel it absurd that he should be asked to extend this hypothesis to the Marcan phrase "*Go, see!*" to which we now return. These words he may declare to be not only simple in themselves, but also in accord with another Marcan tradition about the disciples as having "forgotten" to bring "loaves with them¹."

But the literal truth of that other tradition itself is very doubtful. It is omitted by Luke. And the Marcan context, saying "Save one loaf, they had not [any loaves] in the boat with them," is omitted by Matthew and is suggestive of metaphor literalised. We ought therefore to give a patient consideration to the suggestion that, in the present passage, "*Go, see!*" may be a Marcan misinterpretation of "*Come and see,*" a phrase used in Jewish tradition to call attention to weighty sayings, especially about the ways of God as superior to those of man. John uses a form of it thrice in passages where it is susceptible of a mystical meaning². Also, in particular, "*See*" is applied to numbers when rabbinically interpreted. For example, *Horae Hebraicae* illustrates the "barley loaves" in John by quoting a fanciful exaggeration about the feeding of the sons of the prophets with "loaves of barley" by Elisha, in which "*See!*" occurs thrice; and the formula is sometimes repeated much more frequently³. Somewhat similarly,

¹ Mk viii. 14, parall. Mt. xvi. 5, om. Lk. xii. 1.

² See Schlatter, on Jn i. 39 "*come and ye shall see,*" referring to ib. 46 and xi. 34 and quoting from *Mechilt.* (on Exod. xii. 1, xx. 12) "*Come and see* what God replies to him" and "*Come and see* their reward." See also Wetstein, *Hor. Heb.*, and Schöttgen, on Jn i. 39.

³ *Hor. Heb.* on Jn vi. 9 quoting *Chetub.* 105. 2, 106. 9 on 2 K. iv. 42 "Twenty loaves, and the loaf of the firstfruits, *see*, one and twenty; the green ear, *see*, two and twenty... and so, *see*, there were two thousand and two hundred fed." I substitute "*see*" for "*behold,*" as Wünsche habitually does, e.g. on Numb. vii. 66 foll. p. 372 "*siehe,*

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

in an early Galilaean tradition about the Feeding of the Five Thousand, attention may have been called to the number of the loaves: "*See (or, Go and see) there are five loaves*¹." This was misunderstood by Gentile interpretation (adopted by Mark) as though the first half of the sentence came from Jesus, who said "*Go and see [how many loaves there are],*" and the second half from the disciples, who said "*There are five loaves.*"

It is perhaps worth noting that the phrase "five loaves" occurs in the narrative of an incident in the life of David to which Jesus Himself called attention—the eating of the sacred shewbread by laymen contrary to the Law. All the Gospels mention this. But they do not quote the exact words of David, which are "Give me *five loaves of bread* in mine hand or whatsoever is present²." No other passage in the Bible mentions "*five loaves.*" The meaning appears to be (as the Vulgate renders it) "*even five [if you can give no more].*" "Five" therefore may be regarded as typical of a small number³. In the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Son of David restores and consecrates the "five loaves" that David might be said, in some sort, to have taken away and desecrated. It ought not to be surprising if, apart from other mystical views of the number "five," this allusion in itself caused a Jewish Christian Evangelist to call attention to the coincidence by means of the formula "*Come and see.*" It ought to be less surprising that the formula was misunderstood by Gentiles.

das sind zwei,...siehe, das sind vier..." where it occurs seven times; *ib.* p. 374 it occurs six times.

¹ The Heb. קָם , which regularly means "come," is frequently used for "go," e.g. Gen. xxxi. 18 R.V. "go," LXX ἀπελθεῖν .

² 1 S. xxi. 3 referred to in Mk ii. 26, Mt. xii. 4, Lk. vi. 4.

³ See Lev. xxvi. 8 "*Five* of you shall chase an hundred," and Is. xxx. 17 "*at the rebuke of five.*" The attempt to explain it otherwise (*J. Succa* vi. 8 (Schwab p. 50)) is unsatisfactory.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 22. "Here," in all the Gospels

The Johannine phrase discussed in the last section, "*there is a lad*" is followed by "*here*." "*Here*" is also inserted by Matthew as follows:—

Mk vi. 38	Mt. xiv. 17	Lk. ix. 13
They say (D and SS add "to him"), Five...	But they say to him, We have not <i>here</i> save five...	But they said (<i>lit.</i>) There are not to us more than five...

In *Corrections* it was suggested that "*here*" might be added by Matthew for emphasis, or that there might be some confusion between "*here*" and "*bread*" which are very similar in Hebrew¹. The latter suggestion is favoured by a passage in the Psalms where Gesenius accepts an emendation based on this similarity². But of course both causes might be at work. Matthew repeats the Greek "*here*" in the next verse after a verb of motion in words of Jesus that he alone records, "Bring them *here* to me³." Luke also, in a parallel to Mark-Matthew "the place is desert," has "We are *here* in a desert place⁴." Lastly, in the Feeding of the Four Thousand, "*here*" is inserted by Mark who has "Whence shall one be able *here* to satisfy these with loaves in a wilderness⁵?" but omitted by the parallel Matthew, "Whence [can come] to us in a wilderness so many loaves as to satisfy so great a multitude?" The recurrences of the same word meaning "*here*" or "*hither*" in the narratives of miraculous feeding suggest the examination of the Biblical use of the word above mentioned, meaning "*hither*" but confusable with "*bread*."

It occurs for the first time in the words of the fugitive Hagar whom "the angel of the Lord found by a fountain of

¹ See *Corrections* 403 (i), where it is also pointed out that "to him" and "not" are often confused in Hebrew (see Gesen. 520 b).

² See Gesen. pp. 240—1 on Ps. lxxiii. 10 adopting בָּרֶחֱלֵם "bread" for הֶלֶם "hither."

³ Mt. xiv. 18 φέρετέ μοι ἄδε αὐτούς, not in parall. Mk-Lk.

⁴ Lk. ix. 12.

⁵ Mk viii. 4.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

water in the wilderness of Shur." Hagar exclaims "Have I even *here* looked after him that seeth me¹?" Rashi explains "*even here*" as meaning "*even here in the desert*," and that makes good sense, recognising that God sees everywhere; but the Jerusalem Targums confused the word with an almost identical one meaning "dream" or "vision," and the LXX renders it "face to face²." As a rule, the word means "hither," not "here," and it will be observed that Matthew repeats it (in Greek) in the sense of "hither" on the second occasion.

In the sense of "*here*," it would be appropriate to the disciples, ignorant of their Master's design and saying "*Here [in this lonely place] we have no bread worth mentioning, or, we can do nothing for the multitude.*" But, if "*here*" has this meaning, then "*in this lonely place*" is a desirable addition; for, without it, "*here*" might mean simply "*on the spot.*" Accordingly Mark (in the narrative of the Four Thousand) and Luke, who both use "*here*," add "*in a desert, or lonely place*³." Matthew, in the narrative of the Four Thousand, does not follow Mark in inserting "*here*" along with "*in, a desert*"; but, in the narrative of the Five Thousand, he inserts "*here*" twice, apparently taking it to mean, not "*here in a lonely place*," but "*here on the spot*";—"We have no bread worth mentioning *here on the spot*," to which Jesus replies "Bring it to me *here on the spot.*" Mark, in the Feeding of the Five Thousand, omits "*here*," but apparently implies, like Matthew, that, if inserted, it would have meant "*on the*

¹ Gen. xvi. 13.

² In Daniel, חלם repeatedly means (Theod.) ἐνύπσιον, (LXX) ὄραμα. In Gen. xvi. 13 Onk. has "I have begun to see" (? confusing חלם with some form of חלל). LXX has ἐνύπσιον (? corr. for στυπσιον). In Gen. xvi. 14 LXX has ἐνύπσιον again for וַיֵּחַ = viventis. Elsewhere LXX has ἐνταῦθα (4), ἄδε (4), etc. These facts indicate that ancient interpretation did not (as Gesen. does) limit the word to the sense of "*hither*."

³ Mk viii. 4 (the Four Thousand) πότεν...ἄδε...ἐπ' ἐρημίας; Lk. ix. 12 (the Five Thousand) ἄδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἰσμέν.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

spot"; although the disciples had no bread "*on the spot*," they had some a little way off, as to which Jesus sent to inquire how much there was.

Coming to John's phrase "There is a lad *here*" we have to confess at once that, but for all these variations and apparent allusions in the Synoptists, we should take it to mean simply "*on the spot*" or "*at hand*." But if the "*lad*" is to be regarded as the representative of Moses, and if John had before him various traditions likening the Five Thousand in the Desert to Israel in the Wilderness of Sinai, then we shall not reject as improbable the hypothesis that this saying of Andrew about "a lad here," besides having its literal meaning, might also mystically allude to "*Moses in the wilderness*¹."

§ 23. "By companies²," "by ranks³," in Mark

The Greek for "company," *symposion*, means literally "drinking-party." The Greek for "rank," *prasia*, means perhaps literally "greenery," and in practice a rectangular "garden-bed⁴." Neither of these words is adopted by the

¹ In examining this hypothesis of allusion to the story of Hagar, or of confusion arising from Hebrew corruption, we must not ignore the fact that elsewhere Matthew and Luke appear to insert "hither" simply for emphasis. (See *Corrections* 425 on Mk ix. 19, Mt. xvii. 17, Lk. ix. 41.) And the LXX does sometimes insert it for this reason where it is not in the Hebrew, besides omitting it sometimes where it is in the Hebrew. (See *Corrections* 425 (i) a and b.) But the recurrence of "here" in these narratives of feeding is rather too frequent to be explained thus.

² Mk vi. 39 συμπόσια συμπόσια.

³ Mk vi. 40 πρασιαὶ πρασιαί.

⁴ Hesych. says that πράσα = τὰ βρύα κ. τὰ φυκία, and πρασιαί = αἱ ἐν τοῖς κήποις τετραγῶνοι λαχαναί. The facts suggest that the word originally denoted "*green*" and was then applied to any very common green vegetable, e.g. the leek (comp. in English, "*greens*"). L.S. gives πράσιον = "horehound," and πράσον = (1) leek, (2) a leek-like sea-weed. Hesych. suggests πέρας "boundary" as the origin of the word:—ὅλον πρασιαὶ διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ πέραςι τῶν κήπων. The word πρασιά is frequent in Homer. Field (on Mk vi. 40) shews that the word was not (as has been maintained) associated with the thought of "flower-beds" or "parterres" implying variety of colour.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

parallel Matthew, Luke, or John¹. The question therefore arises whether John has, or has not, in his context, something that expresses the thought underlying Mark's peculiar expressions. If he has not, this passage will have to be recognised as an instance of the failure of the Rule of Johannine Intervention.

Symposion occurs only once in canonical LXX. There it represents the Hebrew phrase "*drinking-party of wine*."² Philo, it is true, repeatedly uses it in describing the sacred meals of the Therapeutae. But he expressly uses it as a paradox, "*contrasting their symposia with the symposia of other*

¹ Mk vi. 39—40
(R.V.)

(39) And he commanded them that all should sit down (*lit. recline*) by companies upon the green grass.

(40) And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties.

Mt. xiv. 19 a
(R.V.)

And he commanded the multitudes to sit down (*lit. recline*) on the grass.

Lk. ix. 14—15
(R.V.)

(14) For they were about five thousand men. And he said unto his disciples, Make them sit down (*lit. recline*) in companies (*κλισίας*), about fifty each.

(15) And they did so, and made them all sit down (*lit. recline*).

Jn vi. 10
(R.V.)

Jesus said, Make the people sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. So the men sat down, in number about five thousand.

In the Feeding of the Four Thousand the reclining is mentioned merely as a command thus:—

Mk viii. 6 a (R.V.)

And he commandeth the multitude to sit down on the ground.

Mt. xv. 35 (R.V.)

And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the ground.

R.V. in these six columns does not represent several differences in the Greek. For example, R.V. "command"—*ἐπιτάσσω*, *κελεύω*, and *παράγγελλω*.

² Esth. vii. 7 *συμπόσιον* = "*drinking-party* (*הנהצו*) of wine (*יין*)."
Συμπόσιον οἶνον = the same Heb. in Sir. xxxv. (xxxii.) 5, xlix. 1. In Is. i. 22 (Aq.) and Hos. iv. 18 (Sym. and Quint.) *συμπόσιον* represents Heb. *כסד* (Gesen. 685 a) "drink," "liquor," (?) "drunken-revelling." The parallel Lk. ix. 14 has *κλισίας*. *Κλισία*, in literary Greek (Steph. *Thes.*) means a "booth" (comp. 3 Macc. vi. 31, the single instance in LXX). But Luke appears to mean "sitting-place" as in Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 2. 12.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

folk," for the Therapeutae, he says, drink nothing but "running water¹." In Mark there is no such contrast. Mark's choice of the word therefore requires explanation. It seems singularly unsuitable in a narrative about feeding with bread and fish where there appears no suggestion, and certainly no mention, of wine, or of anything to drink.

But in fact there is such a suggestion, though a most obscure one, in the Marcan word *prasiai*. For this, though literally meaning only "garden-beds," can be shewn to have practically meant *garden-beds that need irrigation*, that is to say, metaphorically "*drinking*." Aquila assumes this in his rendering of the words "As the hart *thirsteth* (R.V. *panteth*) after the water brooks, so *thirsteth* (R.V. *panteth*) my soul after thee, O God²." Here Aquila uses a verb formed from *prasia*, "garden-bed," to signify "thirsting [like a garden-bed that thirsts for water from heaven]." Ben Sira, too, after representing Wisdom as saying "They that eat me shall yet be hungry and they that drink me shall yet be thirsty," i.e. athirst for heavenly knowledge, uses the word *prasia* as follows: "I will water my best garden, and will water abundantly my *garden-bed*." The thought is of the irrigating trenches of a garden or vineyard, opening their mouths like panting animals, and crying to heaven for water to feed the rows of vegetation. The word occurs in a papyrus of the first century in such a

¹ Philo ii. 477 ἀντιτάξας τὰ τῶν ἄλλων συμπόσια (the word is mentioned about a dozen times in the context). The Therapeutae drink (*ib.* 477) ὕδωρ ἡματιαίων.

² Ps. xlii. 1, see Gesen. 788, נָחַם, "long for," גִּנְיָן "garden terrace or bed." Rashi gives various explanations, and says that "Menachem" illustrates from Cant. v. 12 (R.V. 13) where Aq. has *πρασiai*. Aq. also has *πρασιοῦσθαι* in Joel i. 20 "the beasts of the field *pant* (A.V. *cry*) unto thee," where Jerome says "*like a garden-bed thirsting for rain*. For this is what Aquila means, in one word, saying *ἱπρασιώθη*."

³ Sir. xxiv. 21, 31 ποτιῶ μου τὸν κήπον, καὶ μεθύσω μου τὴν πρασίαν, where μεθύσω, "I will satisfy as if with wine," harmonizes with a hypothesis connecting *πρασiai* with *συμπόσια*.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

context as to shew that it would be naturally connected with irrigation¹.

The Targum on a passage in Ezekiel mentioning what Aquila calls "*garden-beds*" has a slightly different form of the word, meaning "*trenches*," and especially trenches for the irrigation of vines². And the metaphorical name "the vineyard in Jabneh" (some indeed call it no metaphor but a name based on fact) was applied to "the university in that place," the reason being that "the scholars sat *rows* [and] *rows* like a vineyard that is planted *rows* [and] *rows*."³

These facts, taken together, explain Mark's two peculiar traditions. The original appeared to him to describe the multitude as placed "[in] *rows* [and] *rows*," meaning either "like vines," or "like vineyard trenches," waiting for water, the living water of the Word⁴. This was at first expressed by *prasiai*. But as this did not convey clearly to Greeks the notion of thirst, Mark prefaced it by *symposia*⁵. Matthew and Luke omitted both these terms:—*symposia*, "drinking-parties," because it might convey the notion of carousing, and *prasiai*, "garden-beds," because it did not convey to them the

¹ *Berlin Urkunde* 530. 27 "The water scarcely gives drink enough for one row" μόλις γὰρ μίαν πρᾶσιάν (sic) πορίζει τὸ ὕδωρ. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 13 ἐν πνεύμα ἰποτισθημεν and iii. 2 γάλα ὑμᾶς ἰπόρισα, also iii. 6 Ἀπολλὸς ἰπότισεν, "watered" (after "I planted").

² Ezek. xvii. 7, 10 Heb. חֲנוּת, A.V. "furrows," R.V. "beds," Aq. πρᾶσιαι, Targ. חֲנוּת, which="trenches," see Levy iii. 625 *b* and Levy *Ch.* ii. 205 *b*.

³ *Hor. Heb.* on Mk vi. 40 quoting *Jevamoth* cap. 8. For a similar explanation see *Jer. Berach.* iv. 1 fol. 7 *d*, and elsewhere (Levy ii. 408 *b*). The word for "*rows*" is rare in O.T. (Ges. 1004 *b*, quite diff. from the one meaning "garden-bed") but freq. in later Heb. (Levy iv. 525—6).

⁴ This is the aspect of "*rows*" that commended itself to Mark. But there is also the military aspect in which the "*rows*" would be regarded as "*files*," see below, p. 309, n. 3, and pp. 309—14.

⁵ See *Clus* 31 shewing that "the correct rendering in a conflation mostly follows the incorrect one."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

suggestion of spiritual thirst, and they did not see any reason for such an out-of-the-way metaphor.

What course does John adopt? In the narrative of the actual miracle, it must be admitted, he says nothing that in the remotest degree implies a *symposium*. But in Christ's comment we are taught that the "loaves" with which the Five Thousand have been "filled" are but types of a "bread from heaven"; then we learn that this "bread" is Christ Himself; then we are told that He—not the bread but Christ Himself—satisfies "*thirst*" *at the same time as hunger*: "He that cometh unto me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never *thirst*¹." Subsequently the epithet "living"—familiar to the Jews as an epithet of running water—is applied to this "bread" as being a source of spiritual life². And thus we are finally led to a new and astonishing revelation of the nature of this new "food" that is to be "bought" by Jesus—namely that it is to be His own "flesh." The literalising Jews ask "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Jesus, in His answer, increases (for literalisers) the impossibility. He abruptly implies that the "flesh" will not be separated from "blood." Thus at last we are brought to the actual mention of the word "*drink*," for which we have been gradually prepared: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and *drink* his blood, ye have no life in yourselves³." This, once mentioned, is reiterated: "He that eateth my flesh and *drinketh* my blood," "My blood is *drink* indeed," "He that eateth my flesh and *drinketh* my blood abideth in me and I in him⁴." Such is the Johannine expansion of the Marcan *symposia*.

It has not been maintained above that *symposia* was a part of Mark's original, or that Matthew and Luke were wrong in omitting it. The question for us has been, not as to Mark's

¹ Jn vi. 35. This is in response to the prayer "Lord, evermore give us this bread."

² Jn vi. 51.

³ Jn vi. 52—3.

⁴ Jn vi. 54—6.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

correctness, but as to whether John intervenes in order to bring out some spiritual doctrine latent under Mark's text, even when Mark is incorrect or (as in this case) inappropriate in expression. The result has been to reveal, apparently, not a failure but an instance, of Johannine Intervention. And it is a peculiarly interesting one. For here Mark's error appears to have been a Greek husk, so to speak, containing a kernel of Jewish doctrine. This kernel John has extracted, amplifying the exposition of its doctrine so that it illuminates the whole of his conception of Christ's character and action.

As regards *prasiai*, or "garden-beds," it cannot be conclusively shewn that John has similarly intervened. If he regarded the *prasiai* as the Jewish equivalent of the Gentile *symposia*, he may have decided that he had done enough when he had expounded the doctrine implied for Greeks in the Greek word *symposia*¹.

¹ The thought of *πρασιαι* as "rows of vines," thirsting for water, would be very distinct from John's conception of the one Vine. The latter (not "vine-rows" but "vine") may have been in his mind when he writes, as words of Jesus, (vi. 56) "He that...drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him."

If we drink His blood, it follows that, in some sense, He is in us; but how does it follow that we "abide" in Him? An explanation is not given in the doctrine that follows the Feeding, but one is suggested later on, when it is said (Jn xv. 4) that we abide in Christ as branches in the Vine. This means that we are in the Christ-Nature or Vine-Nature, in the Nature that produces the sap and the fruit and that juice of the Vine which is called in Scripture (Gen. xlix. 11) "the blood of grapes." It is *in us*, but we are also *in it* because it is *in us*. This metaphor of the single Vine is more accordant with the ancient Hebrew imagery than is the later Jewish tradition about "vine-rows [and] vine-rows" describing the array of disciples in "the vineyard" of "the university of Jabneh."

If there is any Johannine equivalent of the Marcan *prasiai*—regarded as "rows of vines," thirsting for rain—it is to be looked for in passages describing the "living water," which John alone mentions.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 24. "On the green grass¹," in Mark

Barely stated, the facts bearing on this Marcan phrase might be summed up as a case of Johannine Intervention thus: "Mark has 'on the green grass,' Matthew 'on the grass,' Luke no mention of 'grass' at all, John 'There was much grass in the place'; John obviously intervenes. The Greek *chortos*, 'grass,' mostly means 'hay' in literary Greek, and may have that meaning here. But that does not affect either the fact that Luke omits and John inserts the Marcan *chortos*, or the inference—that it is a case of Johannine Intervention."

All this is true. But if we passed on, content with this, we should pass over a great deal that will be found interesting and illuminative for those who are prepared to recognise truth under metaphor, and to accept guidance toward some parts of the truth from ancient Christian commentaries that must be admitted to be, as to other parts, fanciful and extravagant. Such a comment is that of Jerome (on Matthew): "They are commanded to 'lie down on grass (or, hay) (foenum)' and, according to another (alium) Evangelist, 'on the earth²,' in fifties or hundreds, in order that, after they have trampled (calcaverint)³ on their 'flesh' and all its 'flowers,' and placed

¹ Mk vi. 39—40 ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλιθῆναι πάντας... ἐπὶ τῇ χλωρῇ χόρτῳ, καὶ ἀνέπεσαν... , Mt. xiv. 19 κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου, Lk. ix. 14—15 κατακλίνετε αὐτοὺς κλισίας... , καὶ κατέκλιναν ἅπαντας, Jn vi. 10 Ποιήσατε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναπεσεῖν. ἦν δὲ χόρτος πολὺς ἐν τῇ τόπῳ. ἀνέπεσαν οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες....

² "On the earth" is not said by any Evangelist here. Did Jerome suppose it to be implied by Luke ("make them lie down")? Luke omits "on the grass." On the Feeding of the Four Thousand Jerome (on Matthew) remarks "Ibi *super foenum* discumbunt, hic *super terram*." If Jerome is referring to that we must read here "another [place of the] Evangelist (Mt. xv. 35)."

³ "Trampled," comp. the expostulation in Ezekiel (xxxiv. 18) to the "rams" and "he-goats," which not only eat up the pasture of the weaker cattle but also "tread down" the "residue." What they do in a bad sense, Jerome here supposes to be done in a good sense.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

under [their feet] the pleasures of the world as being merely *drying grass* (or, *hay*) (*arens foenum*)¹, they may then ascend through the penitence denoted by 'fifty' to the perfect height denoted by 'a hundred².'"

In his interpretation of "grass," Jerome is here following Origen, who says "I think He bade the multitude *lie down in the grass* by reason of that which is said in Isaiah 'All flesh is grass'—that is to say, place beneath [their feet] '*the flesh*' and subjugate the disposition of '*the flesh*'³."

This passage of Isaiah is quoted also in the Petrine Epistle as contrasting "*flesh*," which is "*as grass*," with the utterance of the everlasting God; and it is alluded to in the Epistle of James⁴. Jesus Himself did not command His disciples to "trample" on "the flowers"; but He bade them "consider the lilies" and ask themselves whether they might not trust their heavenly Father to clothe them, since He "so clothed the *grass* (*chortos*) of the field⁵."

It is important to recognise that this word *chortos*, when connected with a mention of men and not cattle or agriculture, is likely to have a depreciative meaning. Paul uses it to describe a false and flimsy structure (of "*hay*") built by some

¹ Comp. Is. xl. 6—8 "All flesh is grass (*χόρτος*), and all the goodness thereof is as the *flower* of the field. . . Surely the people is *grass*. The *grass* withereth (*ξηράνθη* = *arens*), the *flower* fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever."

² "Fifty" is mentioned by Mark and Luke, but not by Matthew; "a hundred" is mentioned by Mark alone.

³ Origen (on Mt. xiv. 19) τοὺς ὄχλους ἐκέλευεν ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐν (sic) τῇ χόρτῃ . . . τουτέστιν ὑποκάτω ποιῆσαι τὴν σάρκα καὶ ὑποτάξαι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός.

⁴ 1 Pet. i. 24, Jas. i. 10, 11.

⁵ Mt. vi. 30 εἰ δὲ τὸν χόρτον τοῦ ἀγροῦ . . . Note the difference in Lk. xii. 28 εἰ δὲ ἐν ἀγρῷ τὸν χόρτον . . . Luke rejects the phrase "grass of the field" used by Matthew and frequent in LXX. He substitutes: "But if [while it is still] in the field [or, in a field] the grass—living (*lit.* existing) to-day and [to be] thrown into the oven to-morrow—is so clothed by God." His object is to shew Greek readers that *χόρτος*, in this passage, does *not* have its ordinary meaning "*hay*."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Christians who profess to accept Christ as their "foundation¹." Also in literary Greek the noun *chortos* is regularly used to mean food for beasts, as distinct from corn or wheat that is food for men; and hence the verb *chortazein* is used to mean, not only when applied to cattle "fill with hay (or, with fodder)," but also when applied to men, "cram, or stuff, oneself with food," after the manner of swine².

In LXX, *chortos* is represented mainly by two Hebrew words. Both of these signify "herbage," but one signifies more definitely "green grass" and is once rendered by LXX "green³." It seldom has any such opprobrious sense as in literary Greek⁴. In O.T., where A.V. has "hay" R.V. has "grass" in text or margin⁵; and it is said that people in Palestine do not dry grass as we do for winter fodder, and that there is no evidence that the Hebrews had such a custom⁶.

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 12.

² See Steph. *Thes.* *χόρτος*, and add Epictet. ii. 14. 24 "most men value nothing more than fodder—for wealth is fodder" (comp. *ib.* 29). Epictetus uses *χοράζω* similarly (ii. 16. 43) and once in a passage that resembles a bitter version of a saying of Christ's (i. 9. 19) "You are [as good as] dead. When you are *crammed* (*χορτασθήτε*) for the day, you sit weeping about the [fodder of the] morrow." Ast's two instances in Plato are *Pol.* II. 372 D, IX. 586 A in which men are likened to "swine," or to creatures "stooping down to dinner-tables," *εἰς τραπέζας [κεκυφότες] βόσκονταί χορταζόμενοι καὶ ὀχεύοντες*.

³ See Gesen. 348 חָצִיר "green grass, herbage," 793 עֵשֶׂב "herb, herbage." *Χόρτος* = the former about 12 times, the latter about 25 times (besides other Heb. words much more rarely). In Prov. xxvii. 25, חָצִיר = LXX "green [things]" *χλωρῶν*, R.V. "the hay (marg. grass) is carried and the tender grass sheweth itself."

⁴ The Hebrew "grass" denotes transience but not degradation except in special contexts such as Ps. cvi. 20 "the similitude of an ox that eateth grass," on which see *Tehill.* and Rashi *ad loc.*, also *Mechill.* (on Exod. xiv. 29, Wü. p. 108) and Dan. iv. 25—33 (of Nebuchadnezzar).

⁵ Prov. xxvii. 25, Is. xv. 6, the only instances of "hay" in A.V. (O.T.).

⁶ See Hastings' *Dict.* "Hay," which says "The winter is the season

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Mark has previously used *chortos* in a sense unprecedented (so far as is known at present) to mean the shooting blade of corn (perhaps taking it to mean the early green shoot of corn which the eye cannot distinguish from grass)¹. Here Mark goes further and inserts "green." Perhaps he wishes to make it clear to his readers that he means, not "hay," but "grass²."

Are we then to infer that in the present passage Mark is simply stating a literal fact in the language of the LXX without any allusion to Hebrew Scripture or Jewish tradition? It would be safer to say that he stated what he believed to be a literal fact and to leave it an open question whether his original had an allusive character. For we are dealing with a Gospel narrative about a miraculous giving of "bread," or literally "loaves"; and it is certainly a coincidence to be noted that, in the LXX, the first mention of "bread" (or "loaf," *artos*)—"In the sweat of thy face wilt thou eat *bread*"—immediately follows the words, pronounced as a curse, "Thou shalt eat the *grass* (*chortos*) of the field³."

The question was asked by ancient Jewish teachers "Was there really a change in the doom pronounced by God on Adam? If so, how explain it?" The Jerusalem Targums say it was changed because of Adam's piteous expostulation, and Talmudic tradition supports them: "Lord of the world," cried Adam, "shall I and my ass eat out of one crib⁴?" These

of green grass here." The ignorance of this fact might lead to early misunderstandings.

¹ Mk iv. 28.

² Wetstein, on Mt. vi. 30, says that *χόρτος* is "hay (foenum)," but that here and elsewhere in the Gospels it is used of grass still green, and he quotes Plutarch *Q. N.* p. 25 c *χόρτος νόμενος, κόπτεται γὰρ οὐ ξηρὸς ἀλλὰ χλωρὸς*.

³ Gen. iii. 18—19.

⁴ *Pesach.* 118 a, and sim. *Aboth R. Nathan* on *Aboth* i. 1 "Said the Holy One, Blessed be He: 'As thou hast trembled, therefore in the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat *bread*'" (where Rodkinson italicises "*bread*"). See *Son* 3422 a, which quotes the fuller dialogue

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

traditions are not of the first century. But even in the first century we find Philo making a distinction between the symbolism of "grass" and "green [grass]¹." This, though perhaps derived from Greek influences, indicates that discussions about "grass," and "fodder," and also about the relation of these to that "bread" which is "the word of God," were likely to be current in the first century, among Jews as well as among Christians². On the whole we may say that there is nothing so absurd as there appears to be at first sight in the hypothesis that "*on the green grass*" in the Marcan narrative had, from the first, a poetic and allusive as well as a literal meaning.

Before passing to the Johannine equivalent (in the phrase "now there was much grass in the place") we must note, as a part of John's consistent treatment of the whole subject, his way of dealing with the verb *chortazein* derived from *chortos* "grass," and meaning "*to fill with grass*." It is applied by all the Synoptists to the multitudes, meaning "they were filled" in the sense of "satisfied³." For this, they have some authority in the LXX, but hardly any except in the Psalms⁴.

in the Targums, where God is regarded not as altering, but as interpreting, "the herb," עשׂו. This = *chortos* seven times in Genesis, beginning with i. 11 βοτάνην (נע״ן) *chortou* (עשׂו).

¹ Philo i. 48 (on Gen. ii. 4 foll.). "Grass" = *chortos*, "green [grass]" = *chlōron*.

² *Chortos* occurs in early Christian writers (s. Goodspeed) only in Justin's *Dialogue* § 20 *passim* (apart from quotations in *ib.* §§ 34 and 50). There Justin, after saying that God (Gen. ix. 3) gave Noah the right to eat of every animal, represents the Jew as on the point of interrupting him: "And as he was ready to say '*as the herbs of green-vegetation* (λάχανα *chortou*)' I anticipated him." This shews that *chortos* was a recognised topic of discussion.

³ Mk vi. 42, Mt. xiv. 20, Lk. ix. 17. Comp. Mk viii. 4—8, Mt. xv. 33—7 (about the Four Thousand).

⁴ The Heb. עָשׂו meaning "satisfy" or "sate" = (Tromm.) ἐμπλήθω or ἐμπίμπλημι 50 times, and πλήθω 19 times, but χορτάζω only 13 times (Tromm., by error, 12), and, of these 13 instances, 9 are in the Psalms.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

It must be admitted that Paul once uses it about himself. And his language might be rendered (somewhat tamely) "I have been initiated into the secret both of *having-my-fill* (*chortasein*) and *hungering*¹." But it is better to regard it as Pauline hyperbole (almost equivalent to "stuffing and starving"). And to most Greeks, unacquainted with the LXX, the Synoptic statement would certainly sound like a reproach—as if it meant that the Five Thousand were "filled like swine" without thanks to the giver and without sense of the nature of the gift². By John the word is thus reproachfully used, not in his own words but (which is more weighty) in the words of Jesus to condemn their unintelligent greediness: "Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves and *were filled* [*like cattle with fodder*]³." The words that follow enjoin "labour"—and labour like that of the husbandman, which distinguishes

¹ Philipp. iv. 12 μεμύημαι καὶ χορτάζεσθαι καὶ πεινᾶν. On this, Lightfoot, while admitting that it was originally not applied to men except in a depreciatory sense, adds that "in the later language it has lost this sense...being applied commonly to men and directly opposed to πεινᾶν, e.g. Matth. v. 6. On χορτάζεω see Sturz *de Dial. Mac.* p. 200."

But Sturz does not give a single instance where a serious writer of literary Greek, uninfluenced by the Gospels, applies it to men without depreciation. The Synoptic Gospels prove nothing except that they were influenced by the usage of the Psalms. Epictetus always uses it of men in a bad sense and so does Plutarch (ii. 616 A) in the single instance given in the Index. The first eleven volumes of the *Oxyrhynchian Papyri* and the first four volumes of the *Berlin Urkunde* do not contain the word in any sense.

² Goodspeed shews that the only Christian instance of χορτάζεω up to A.D. 150 is Clem. Rom. § 59 τοὺς πλωμένους τοῦ λαοῦ σου ἐπιστρέφον, χορτάσον τοὺς πεινῶντας. But this (like Polyc. Phil. § 6) alludes to Ezek. xxxiv. 16 πεπλανημένον ἐπιστρέψω...καὶ βοσκήσω, which follows *ib.* 15 "I myself will feed my sheep." This indicates that Clement uses the word metaphorically in a prayer to God to "satisfy" His hungering "sheep."

³ Jn vi. 26. This is Jn's only instance of χορτάζεω.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

man from cattle: "Labour not for the food that perisheth, but for the food that abideth unto eternal life¹."

In conclusion, the apparent attitude of the other Evangelists to Mark's peculiar tradition "on the green grass," may be roughly described as follows. Matthew omits "green," possibly regarding it as a mere picturesque epithet. Luke omits the whole phrase, perhaps as being of doubtful meaning, and perhaps because, looking at Mark's picture from a western point of view as an expanse of long grass not yet cut, he thought that five thousand men, lying down on it, would do mischief such as Jesus would not have sanctioned. John, omitting "green," suggests that it may have been "hay," not "grass." Also he suggests the same thing by slightly altering the context. For he does not speak of "*the grass*" as a natural element in the scene (like "*the trees*," "*the forest*," etc.). He suggests that there *happened to be a great quantity of hay lying about in swaths in that district*². If that was, or was supposed to be, the case, it would be an occasion on which Jesus might naturally be supposed to say to the multitude, somewhat as in the Sermon on the Mount, "*consider the grass of the field how God provideth it with clothing*." This, in Hebrew or Aramaic, might be expressed by "*set [your minds] on the grass of the field*." But this is liable to be confused with "*set yourselves on, i.e. lie down on, the grass of the field*"³."

¹ Jn vi. 27, on which (and on ἐργάσθε, meaning agricultural labour) see Son 3017, 3421 f. The words accord with the above-mentioned prayer of Adam to God that he might be allowed to work for bread instead of browsing on grass.

² If the Passover was (Jn vi. 4) "at hand," some might suppose hay-making to be going on (but see p. 304, n. 6). Nonnus seems to imply "happened to be" by τις in his paraphrase of Jn vi. 10 ἦν δὲ τις αὐτόθι χόρτος ἀπειρίτος. The multitude (he says) took their meal "on the top of the hay," ἐν ᾧ τοῖς χόρτου. "Each man was leaning as it were against a party-wall all of them reclining in rows," ἕκαστος ἐρείδετο γείτονι τοίχῳ κεκλιμένοι στοιχηδόν. That is, they leaned against the "swaths" covering a widely extended space.

³ See Gesen. p. 963 on Judg. xix. 30 where the Heb. has "Set ye for yourselves (לכם) upon it" = R.V. "consider of it," LXX (Swete) θέσθε

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

This would give, as the original, a tradition somewhat resembling the spiritual interpretation of Origen and Jerome, but with an important difference. It would be, not "Set yourselves *above*, or *against*, the grass of the field, as if it were an enemy to be conquered," but "*Set yourselves [to think] over it* in order to learn the lesson that it teaches¹."

§ 25. "By hundreds and by fifties," in Mark²

Mark is the only one of the Evangelists that mentions "hundreds" in this connection. What he has in view is five thousand men in a hundred parallel rows, each row containing fifty men³. If he had previously mentioned five thousand as

ὑμῖν αὐτοὶ ἐπ' αὐτήν..., Targ. "set your hearts upon it." The Gk varies greatly. Field reads αὐτοῖς. And θέσθε ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς ἐπ' αὐτήν might be supposed to be an error for θέσθε ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ αὐτήν.

¹ Comp. 4 Esdr. ix. 24—27 "'Ibis in campum florum, ubi domus non est aedificata, et manduces (sic) solummodo de floribus campi....' Et sedi ibi in floribus et de herbis agri manducavi... in saturitatem... et ego discumbebam supra foenum." The meaning is obscure, but it is probable that "*reclining on the hay*" has a metaphorical meaning. The thought in the context (ix. 29—37) does not appear to be Christian. It speaks of the "sowing" of "the Law" in "the wilderness." A receptacle (it says) remains as a rule when its contents perish. But Israel, the receptacle of the Law, perishes while the Law abides. This is (in word at all events) opposed to Jn xii. 24 "except a grain of wheat...die, it abideth by itself alone."

² Mk vi. 40

Mt. om.

Lk. ix. 15

Jn vi. 10

καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρᾶ-
σια, κατὰ
ἐκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πεν-
τήκοντα.

καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτως
καὶ κατέκλιναν ἅπαν-
τας.

ἀνέπεσαν οὖν οἱ
ἄνδρες (οἱ, ἀνέπεσαν
οὖν, ἄνδρες) τὸν ἀριθ-
μὸν ὡς πεντακισχίλιοι.

In the preceding verse, Luke (ix. 14), after stating the total number himself, has represented Jesus as dictating to His disciples the number in *each group*, κατακλίνετε αὐτοὺς κλισίας ὡσεὶ ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα. The total number is not specified by Mark and Matthew till the conclusion of the narrative (Mk vi. 44, Mt. xiv. 21).

³ "Rows." This is the word suggested by Mark's "garden-borders." But the reader must be prepared to substitute "files" for "rows," if it appears later on that the original contemplated a military arrangement in which each "row" or "file" was composed

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the total (as Luke has done) he need not have mentioned "hundreds," for "five thousand [arranged] by fifties" (which, in effect, is what Luke says) implies "fifty hundreds." But Mark has not yet mentioned "five thousand." Moreover he desires his readers to see the multitude in regular array—geometrically, so to speak—in oblong "garden-borders," as has been pointed out above. Hence his peculiar tradition—in effect, "a hundred by fifty."

It is not surprising that Matthew omits the Marcan phrase, for it would interfere with Matthew's addition of "women and children¹." But it is, if not surprising, at least worth considering, that Luke, desiring perhaps to condense Mark, chooses to omit "hundred" rather than "fifty." Is there any indication that he may have been influenced by Jewish traditions about companies of "fifty," in connection with Israel—either Israel in the wilderness receiving the Law of God, or Israel as God's army marshalled for war?

For poetic or prophetic Jewish traditions about companies of fifty we naturally turn to comments on the words of Isaiah about "the judge and the prophet...*the captain of fifty*²." Jerome dilates on the mystical significance of "fifty," in connection with "repentance," "Pentecost," etc. He does this (he says) because the "captain (princeps)" of repentance is Christ, and he quotes the words of the Jews to Jesus "thou

of 50 men. See L. S. on *στοιχος*, "esp. of persons standing one behind another," and "of soldiers, a file."

¹ Also it might mean "a hundred at a time and fifty at a time." Comp. 1 K. xviii. 4 "a hundred...and hid them *fifty [at a time]* (*κατὰ πενήκοντα*)," or "*fifty in one place and fifty in another*." See *Sanhedr.* 39 b. Rashi says that there were "two caves." Origen (*Comm. Matth.* xi. 3) says that the ranks were hundreds and fifties "since there are different ranks (*τάγματα*) of those who need the nourishment [that comes] from Jesus, because not all are nourished by equal *logoi* (*τοῖς ἰσοῖς λόγοις*)"—an explanation of which the chief value is that it proves that he considered some explanation of Mark's twofold numbering to be necessary.

² Ia. iii. 2—3.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

art not yet *fifty years old*," as indicating their refusal to accept Him as their "*captain of fifty*¹." Whence did Jerome receive this explanation of "*captain of fifty*"? Rashi and Ibn Ezra say nothing about it. One of the most poetic treatises of the Talmud says "Do not read '*captain of fifty*,' but '*captain of fifths*².' This is he who knows how to handle matters in the *five sections* of the Law." But it adds another explanation "An interpreter is not appointed over the congregation, who is less than *fifty years old*³." This accords with Jerome's above-quoted application of "*captain of fifty*."

Another Jewish tradition, also highly poetic and mystical, after quoting Zechariah and Jeremiah on "The Branch" and adding "This is the Messiah," represents God as saying "I will set up a '*captain over fifty*,' " implying that this "*captain*," too, is the Messiah. Then it numbers the books of the Bible, and the divisions of some of the books, and makes out the total to be "*fifty*." Thus "*captain of fifty*," without any change of "*fifty*" to "*fifths*," is made to mean the same thing as "*captain of fifths*" above, that is, "Master of Scripture⁴."

These Jewish variations of interpretation are partly caused by the fact that, in Hebrew, "*fifty*" is the plural of "*five*" and easily confused with "*five*," and partly by the fact that the word, when used as the plural participle of a verb, means "*arranged in battle array*⁵." A notorious instance of such

¹ In some of these remarks Jerome resembles Origen (on Numb. iv. 3, 47, Lomm. x. 35, 41), but Origen does not there quote Is. iii. 3 (nor Jn viii. 57, perhaps, anywhere).

² "*Fifths*" (Levy ii. 78 b) a name given to the five books of the Pentateuch, and the five books of the Psalms.

³ *Chag.* 14 a.

⁴ *Numb.* r. on Numb. xvi. 35 (Wü. p. 451).

⁵ See Gesen. 332 b. An explanation suggests itself from "*quincunx*," e.g. *Caes. Bell. Gall.* vii. 73 "*obliquis ordinibus in quincuncem dispositis*." Gesen., however, does not offer this explanation, but suggests doubtfully (1) "*Ar. army*," and (2) "*army as composed of five parts*" (not explaining what the "*five parts*" are). The

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

confusion occurs in the description of the going forth of Israel from Egypt, "And the children of Israel went up *arranged-in-battle-array* out of the land of Egypt¹." Here R.V. has "*armed*"; A.V. "*harnessed*" (i.e. "*in armour*") in text, but "*by five in a rank*" in margin; LXX "*in the fifth generation*"; Aquila "*in armour*"; Symmachus "*hoplites*," i.e. "*heavy-armed soldiers*"; Theodotion "*on the fifth day*." Besides these variations, there are others in Jewish tradition. Onkelos adopts "*armed*," and the second Jerusalem Targum "*armed with good works*." But the first Targum has "*every one with five children*." Rashi, who accepts "*armed*," adds "Others say '*the fifth part*,' because four-fifths died in the darkness of Egypt." There are other interpretations of all kinds, some of which take the word as meaning "*fifty*," or even "*five hundred*."

quincunx is so called from its resemblance to the arrangement of the five spots on dice * * *. The Heb. occurs only in Exod. xiii. 18, Josh. i. 14, iv. 12, Judg. vii. 11 (but perhaps it should be read also in Numb. xxxii. 17).

¹ Exod. xiii. 18.

² Exod. xiii. 18, Field *agmine instructo*, LXX *πέρπτη γενεῇ*, Aq. *ἐνωπλισμένοι*, Sym. *ὀπλίται*, Theod. *πεμπταίζοντες*—which Field illustrates from the medical use of *τριταΐζω* and *τεταρταΐζω*, to suffer from a "tertian" or a "quartan" fever. Does Theod. regard the Israelites as being delivered from disease (comp. Deut. xxviii. 60 "the diseases of Egypt")?

Jerome, quoted by Field, defends Aquila's rendering, but says "Licet pro eo quod nos *armati* diximus... *instructi*, sive *muniti*, propter suppellectilem qua Ægyptios spoliaverunt, possit intelligi." He seems to see the difficulty of supposing that the Israelites had "armour" before they took it from the Egyptians who were drowned in the Red Sea (as Josephus says *Ant.* ii. 16. 6).

³ *J. Sabb.* vi. 4 has "*with five kinds of arms*," *Mechilt.* ad loc. also has this, but adds (2) "*ready*" or "*alert*," (3) "*one out of five*," (4) "*one out of fifty*," (5) "*one out of five hundred*." *Pesikt.* (Piska x. Wü. p. 110) gives, as the last of five explanations, "R. Jose said that they went forth '*to five generations (zu fünf Geschlechtern)*'"—apparently including great-great-grandparents with the babes descended from them (not, as LXX, "in the fifth generation [from the Coming of Israel into Egypt]").

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

It is reasonable to suppose that poetic Jewish Christian traditions describing one of Christ's Eucharists, or Common Meals of Thanksgiving, accompanying the Giving of the Word of God, might lay stress (as Philo repeatedly does in describing the meals of the Therapeutae) on the order and harmonious regularity pervading the assembly¹, and that this might be expressed in language that alluded to the Going Forth of Israel from Egypt to receive the Bread of the Law, as well as to narratives about the actual giving of bread by Elisha, or about the giving of manna. The language of Paul—like the language of Exodus—often takes a military aspect. Mostly he connects it with the single Christian warrior. But he appears to be thinking of Christians "in the ranks," when he tells the Colossians that, though he is absent from them, he rejoices to call to view the "[soldier-like] order and solid-formation" that characterize them as believers in Christ².

If at one or more of what we may call Christ's camp-meetings He commanded the people to be arranged in groups for the purpose of order, it would be natural that the group should be "fifty" (rather than the Latin military unit of a hundred). This would of course not imply military intention or anything except Jewish custom. But when the story afterwards came to be told in Christian traditions, Greeks would not be able to see any reason for grouping "according to fifty." It might be explained to them that it meant "in military order"—for example, "*according to the pattern of the quincunx*"—and that, as there were five thousand men, and fifty centuries, the division might be indifferently described as into a hundred fifties or fifty centuries. Mark thus inserts both numbers. But to some it might occur that vines also

¹ See Philo ii. 481 "before the lying down (*κατακλίσεως*), standing consecutively, [*row by row*], in order (*ἰξῆς κατὰ στοίχον ἐν κόσμῳ*)," *ib.* 483 *ἐν αἷς ἐδήλωσα τάξεσι . . . ἐν κόσμῳ*, *ib.* 484 *κατὰ τάξεις ἐν κόσμῳ*.

² Coloss. ii. 5 *τάξιν καὶ στερῖωμα*, comp. Philo on *τάξεις* above quoted.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

were habitually planted "*according to the quincunx*," and that groups of that kind (*prasiai* or *symposia*) were better suited to the scene of a Christian love-feast than companies of soldiers. Hence might spring the other details in Mark's version. To Matthew all these detailed illustrations, especially those based on the military meaning of "fifty," would naturally seem doubtful in view of the presence of "women and children" whom he (alone of the Evangelists) adds to the five thousand¹. Luke follows Mark as to the traditional "*fifty*," but appears to regard all the rest of Mark's context as superfluous.

Since Luke does not reject the Marcan "*fifty*" and can hardly be said to reject the Marcan "hundred"—because he virtually implies it by his context—there is no ground for expecting, as to these numerical details, any Johannine Intervention. But it has been pointed out above that John does appear to intervene as to the Marcan *symposia*, so as to emphasize an interpretation of these "companies" alien from military thought. Consistently with this non-military aspect, John also rejects the Mark-Luke numbers of the "companies." We cannot say that he does it for Matthew's reason—because "women and children" are to be added. For John does not mention them. Perhaps he does it because this division of the five thousand into small companies of men—as a Roman army might be divided into centuries under centurions, or a Jewish army into fifties under "captains of fifty"—introduces a kind of intermediate agency between each of the five thousand and the One Lord. This intermediation John ignores. In his Gospel, Jesus alone distributes the bread to each—as we shall see later on—not through the instrumentality of His disciples, but with His own hands.

¹ Mt. xiv. 21, also xv. 38.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 26. "Taking," "blessing," and "looking up to heaven"¹

(1) "Taking" occurs in all the six narratives, with the same Greek verb, and mostly as a participle². Its meaning will depend on the place or person whence the loaves are "taken." If they are on the spot, "taking" would appear to mean a solemn and emblematic taking up in the hands, such as might denote a "taking up," or "offering," to God, or an appropriation of the food to God, as though the breaker of bread said to God in the name of the company "We bless thee for *this*, which we lift up³."

¹ Mk vi. 41
(R.V.)

And he took (λαβών) the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake the loaves; and he gave to the disciples to set before them; and the two fishes divided he among them all.

Mt. xiv. 19
(R.V.)

...And he took (λαβών) the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake and gave the loaves to the disciples, and the disciples to the multitudes.

Lk. ix. 16
(R.V.)

And he took (λαβών) the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed them, and brake; and gave to the disciples to set before the multitude.

Jn vi. 11
(R.V.)

Jesus therefore took the loaves; and having given thanks, he distributed to them that were set down; likewise also of the fishes as much as they would.

"Brake" in Mk vi. 41, Lk. ix. 16 is *κατέκλασεν*, see p. 321 foll.

In the Four Thousand, as in the Johannine Five Thousand, "give thanks (*εὐχαριστεῖν*)" is substituted for "bless (*εὐλογεῖν*)."

Mk viii. 6—7 (R.V.)

(6) ...And he took (λαβών) the seven loaves, and having given thanks, he brake, and gave to his disciples, to set before them; and they set them before the multitude.

Mt. xv. 36 (R.V.)

And he took the seven loaves and the fishes; and he gave thanks and brake, and gave to the disciples, and the disciples to the multitudes.

(7) And they had a few small fishes: and having blessed them, he commanded to set these also before them.

² John in the Five Thousand, and Matthew in the Four Thousand, have *ἔλαβεν*, not *λαβών*.

³ Schöttgen on Mt. xiv. 19 says "*Sumptio ista, quae hic et alibi memoratur, actus est peculiaris patris familias*," and quotes *Sabb. 117 b* ὅς (Goldschmidt "*hielt*"). But Schlatter on Jn vi. 11

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

The first Biblical instance of "take," in connection with sacrifice, is where God says to Abraham "*Take for me* a heifer," and other creatures, and it is added that Abraham "*took for him* all these...¹." Philo comments on the pregnancy of "*Take for me*," which implies, he says, first, that we have nothing good of our own except that which we "*take*" from God; secondly, that we are to "*take*" it *for Him*, as being the loan or deposit that He has placed with us, for which we must give account². He also comments on the paradox implied in human "giving," since, "strictly speaking, we merely *take* (or, *receive*) but are only popularly said to give³."

In doctrine of this kind there is sometimes difficulty in passing from a Greek translation back to a Hebrew original because the same Hebrew word, as a rule, represents both "take" and "receive⁴." But we find Paul, as well as Philo,

quotes *Siphri* לרנ on Numb. vii. 6 "Mose nimmt sie (נִסְמָה)." *Hor. Heb.* (on Mt. xxvi. 26) quotes, from the Passover Service, "He *takes up* the unleavened bread in his hand, and saith, 'We eat this unleavened bread...'...then...*taking* two loaves, he breaks one," and (p. 352, from *Berach.* 51 a) "he *takes up* (נִסְמָה) the cup in both hands, but puts it into his right hand; he *lifts it* from the table a hand's breadth and...fixes his eyes upon it, etc."

Λαβών, or *ἔλαβεν*, also occurs in the Synoptic and Pauline accounts of the Lord's Supper. Lk. xxii. 17 δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν is exceptional. λαμβάνει occurs in Jn xxi. 13 "Jesus cometh and *taketh* the loaf and giveth to them...."

¹ Gen. xv. 9—10. Λάβε μοι (A.V. and R.V. "take me")...ἔλαβεν δὲ αὐτῷ (A.V. "took unto him," R.V. "took him"). Onkelos has "offer *coram me*," Jer. Targ. "accipe *mihi* oblationes et offer *coram me*."

² Philo i. 487 λάβε, μὴ σεαυτῷ, δανείων δὲ ἢ παρακαταθήκην νομίσας τὸ δοθῆναι.

³ Philo i. 490 κυρίως μὲν λαμβάνομεν, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ διδόναι λεγόμεθα. In *Quaest. ad Genes.* it is said, *ad loc.* "Pro illo *Fertio mihi*, optime dictum est *Accipe mihi*."

⁴ Heb. נָחַל = λαμβάνω more than 800 times, δέχομαι 26 times. The total number of instances of δέχομαι in *Oxf. Conc.* correctly representing a Heb. original is only 42. The LXX throws too great a burden on λαμβάνω and too little on δέχομαι. Luke alone

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

inculcating that we have nothing that we did not "*take*," that is, "*receive*," and, in the Acts, reminding the Ephesians of "the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said that it was more blessed to give than to *take*¹." The testimony of these two early writers, when combined with the use of the Greek "*take*" in the Pentateuch and in the Synoptic and Pauline accounts of the Eucharist, makes it probable that "*take*" has a ritual meaning also in the Gospel miracles of feeding, and that the Evangelists regarded its meaning there as akin to its meaning later on in the Last Supper.

Passing to the Fourth Gospel we find that the "*taking*" is the one point—out of the three mentioned at the beginning of this section—in which it verbally agrees with the Synoptists. But, by introducing "a lad" on the spot as "*having*" the loaves and fishes, it introduces a possible difference as to the nature of the "*taking*"—leaving us in doubt whether Jesus receives them as an offering from the "*lad*," or takes them from the "*lad*" as the property of the disciples. There is an indefiniteness here like that in the Feeding of the Seven Disciples who "when they got out upon the land, see a fire of coals there and a fish laid thereon and a loaf²." The "*loaf*" that they "*see*" reminds us of what Elijah "*looked*" at when he "*looked, and behold, there was at his head a cake baken on the coals.*" Elijah is bidden by "*an angel*" to "*arise and eat*³." In the Feeding of the Seven, no "*angel*" is mentioned, but a supernatural origin of the food is clearly indicated; and then the "*taking*" of it

uses *δέχομαι* in Eucharistic narrative (xxii. 17) *δεξιόμενος ποτήριον* (Mk-Mt. *λαμβάνει*). Delitzsch renders it by the same word (*empf*) as he uses to represent the Eucharistic *λαμβάνει*.

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 7, Acts xx. 35.

² Jn xxi. 9.

³ 1 K. xix. 5 (Heb.) "Behold an angel (LXX 'some one (*τις*)') touched him, and said unto him, Arise and eat." This Hebrew word "*coals*" occurs only in 1 K. xix. 6 and Is. vi. 6 of Isaiah's preparation for the work of prophecy (Gesen. 954 a).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

by Jesus is described thus: "Jesus *cometh* and *taketh* the loaf and *giveth* to them—and the fish likewise¹."

It has been shewn (p. 290) that the "lad" might well correspond to Moses. Now the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, after saying that the Word, or Only Begotten, was full of grace and truth, and that "from his *fulness* we all received," explains the reception thus: "For the Law was given through Moses; the grace and the truth" [of God, whether latent and included in the Law of Israel, or latent and included in the laws of conscience and human nature] "came into being through Jesus Christ²." If the Law, illustrated by the Psalms and the Prophets, corresponds to the five loaves and the fishes, and "Moses" to "the lad," then the "fulness" that brings forth "the grace and the truth" is expressed by that multiplying power of the Saviour which results in food for five thousand souls with a superabundance of "the fulnesses of twelve baskets."

(2) "Blessing" is not used by John, who substitutes "giving thanks," expressed by the Greek *eucharistein*, familiar to us in "Eucharist." One reason for this is indicated by the variations in the versions of Mark and Luke where "blessed *them*" is altered to "blesses *over them*³." Jews regarded food as God's gift, *over* which, or *for* which, men were bound to bless the Giver; but they did not bless the food⁴. On the other

¹ Jn xxi. 13 ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς. The impression left on the reader is that Jesus "comes" to each disciple separately, and "takes" and "gives" the loaf to each separately, and that there is no "breaking." The whole loaf is perhaps regarded as given to each, being miraculously reproduced. *Acts of John* § 8 uses "distributed" or "divided" of a single loaf, thus, τὸν δὲ αὐτοῦ [ἄρτον] εὐλογῶν διμέριζεν ἡμῖν.

² Jn i. 14—17, on which see *Joh. Gr. Index*.

³ In Mk viii. 7 εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατίθηναι, Delitzsch omits "*them*," SS has "and *upon them* also *having blessed*," D has εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκέλευσεν παρατίθηναι (sic). In Lk. ix. 16 εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς, Delitzsch, D, a, and b have "*blessed upon them*," and SS has "*blessed upon them* (or, *upon it*)."

⁴ Gesen. 139 gives only 1 S. ix. 13 as instance of a priest "blessing"

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

hand, when God Himself is said for the first time in Scripture to "bless," He blesses the fishes and the birds and bids them "multiply." Also when He blesses "bread," or "fruit," or other articles of food, it signifies that He gives increase as well as wholesomeness¹. Hence in Christ's Feeding of the Multitudes, where loaves and fishes were assumed to be multiplied, it is readily intelligible that some Evangelists would regard the word "blessing" as being used in a special and divine sense, so that it implied multiplying, while others would regard it as meaning the usual "blessing" before a meal in the ordinary way.

One way of avoiding ambiguity would be to substitute "give thanks" for "bless." In the Feeding of the Four Thousand Matthew does this, while Mark has, first, "*gave thanks and brake*" about the loaves, and secondly, "*blessed them* [i.e. *the fishes*]." It is not surprising that John almost entirely avoids the word "bless," as being a technical Jewish term². Origen says that "when men '*bless*' God it stands for '*praising*' or '*thanking*' God³." In Leviticus and elsewhere, where LXX has "*praise*," Aquila has *eucharistia*, or "*thanksgiving*⁴." The latter includes a sense of gratefulness and

a sacrificial meal, and here Rashi says that the Targum has "*over* the food." But Breithaupt points out that in the extant text of the Targum, "*over*" is omitted. See Levy *Ch.* ii. 293, taking עַל as "spread out [the hands]," but Breithaupt takes it as "break."

¹ Gen. i. 22, Exod. xxiii. 25, Deut. vii. 13.

² John uses no form of *εὐλογέω* except in xii. 13 *εὐλογημένος*—the cry of the multitude, perhaps regarded as the fickle multitude. Philo (i. 453), quoting Gen. xii. 2 (on which see Rashi), says that *εὐλογημένος* "is reckoned along with (*παραριθμείται*) the [*vain*] opinions and reports of the multitude (*ταῖς τῶν πολλῶν δόξαις τε καὶ φήμαις*)," but that *εὐλογητός* is reckoned "along with *that which is in truth praiseworthy* (*τῷ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν εὐλογητῷ*)."

³ Origen (Lat.) *Comm. Rom.* ix. 14 (on Rom. xii. 14).

⁴ Lev. vii. 12 "If he offer it for (*ὑπὲρ*) a *thanksgiving* (*תודה*)," *περὶ αἰνέσεως*, Aq. *ἐπὶ εὐχαριστίας*. *Εὐχαριστία* recurs several times in Aquila, especially in the Psalms. But neither Aquila nor canon. LXX uses *εὐχαριστέω*.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

spontaneousness, not so manifest in "praise"; and the latter, *eucharistein*, is the term adopted by John in the Feeding of the Five Thousand as a substitute for the Synoptic "bless¹."

(3) "Looking up to heaven" is expressed in the Synoptists by a word that often means "*recovering sight*." John substitutes "lifting up his eyes²"; but places it, not where the Synoptists do, before the breaking and distribution, but at the outset of the narrative, where Jesus "seeth that a great multitude is coming to him," that is, sees the vision of the coming of the spiritual seed of Abraham which was to constitute the Church. The action, both here and in the two other Johannine instances of it, seems to imply a looking up to heaven, not so much to bring down a blessing as rather to behold, and to exult in, and to fulfil, the glory of God. At the grave of Lazarus, when Jesus "lifted his eyes above," He utters, not prayer but thanks, "Father, I give thanks to thee

¹ "*Bless*" might be substituted for "*give thanks*" in translating from Hebrew. The Heb. יָדָה, "*acknowledge* [God's greatness, glory, kindness, etc.]" is rendered εὐλογέω in Isaiah xii. 1 (LXX) εὐλογῶ σε, κύριε, xxxviii. 19 οἱ ζῶντες εὐλογήσουσίν σε (and in effect a third instance occurs in Is. xxv. 3 εὐλογήσουσὶ σε (אֲדָה mistaken for יָדָה)). The Heb. יָדָה is given by Delitzsch in Mt. xi. 25, Lk. x. 21 ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, R.V. "I *thank* (marg. or, *praise*) thee, O Father," where John would probably have written, as in the words uttered at the grave of Lazarus, (xi. 41) εὐχαριστῶ σοι. In wrestling with death for the sake of Lazarus there was an act of sacrifice which some would have called the subject of prayer rather than of a thankoffering. But Jesus "thanks" God for the power to perform it. In the Johannine Feeding of the Five Thousand, Jesus is regarded not merely as breaking bread and blessing God over it as at a meal, but also as offering up a thankoffering to the Father for giving power to the Son to offer Himself to, and for, the multitude. They do not accept Him; nevertheless Jesus, looking into the future, might see cause for *eucharistia* as in Mt.-Lk. referred to above, "I thank thee, O Father... that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding and didst reveal them unto babes."

² Ἀναβλέπω, used in no other sense by John (ix. 11, 15, 18, comp. Mk viii. 24, x. 51, etc.).

³ Jn vi. 5 ἐπάρas οὐν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς....

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

that thou hast heard me¹." Before the Last Discourse, though there is prayer, there is also a vision of "the hour" of glory: "Lifting up his eyes to heaven he said, Father, the hour is come. Glorify thy Son that the Son may glorify thee²."

§ 27. "*Breaking in pieces*" or "*breaking*"

We now approach a subject of unusual difficulty and complexity—complicated partly by verbal ambiguities, partly by early Christian custom arising out of Jewish custom, and partly by Christian doctrinal considerations and applications of Hebrew prophecy—the "breaking" of bread in the miracles of Feeding.

In the Feeding of the Five Thousand (but not in that of the Four Thousand) Mark emphasizes this act by using a compound verb that means literally "break down," "snap off," or (metaphorically) "break down in spirit³." But it is apparently used by him to mean "break in pieces." It occurs but once in LXX and is non-existent in Christian writers of the first century and a half. Yet Luke follows Mark in using it here, though it occurs nowhere else in N.T., and though the uncompounded verb is quite frequent (as also is the noun) to denote Christian "breaking of bread." Mark may have desired to shew that this was *not* an ordinary "breaking of bread," but that Jesus broke a loaf into minute parts each one of which was magnified. Luke may have followed Mark for the same reason.

At all events Luke does follow Mark, and this is one of

¹ Jn xi. 41.

² Jn xvii. 1.

³ Mk vi. 41, Lk. ix. 16 κατέκλασεν. The word is not in Goodspeed's Concordances. In LXX, it occurs only in Ezek. xix. 12 (Heb.) "she was *plucked up* in fury," κατεκλάσθη ἐν θυμῷ. It occurs also in Job v. 4 (Symm.) Heb. "*they are crushed* in the gate." Steph. *Thes.* does not give any instance where the word must necessarily be interpreted "break in pieces," but a great number where it has a different meaning.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

several cases where, when Luke agrees with Mark, John appears to disagree, or at all events tacitly dissents. For John omits all mention of any kind of "breaking." By this course he avoids such a question as "Were the fishes broken as well as the loaves?" Mark implies that they were not. For he (and he alone) specially inserts "*the loaves*" after the mention of "*breaking*," and then he (alone) adds "he divided the two fishes to all," apparently implying that, although they were "divided" in the sense of "distributed," the fishes were *not* "broken¹."

It may be suggested that John had also another reason, based on the axiom that the Bread, or the Fish, is to be regarded as One and as diffusing unity among those who partake of it. In accordance with this thought, he (and he alone of the Evangelists) quotes, as a prophecy about the Crucifixion, the precept concerning the Paschal Lamb, "A bone of him shall not be broken²." Later on, in the presence of the Seven Disciples, Jesus "cometh, and taketh the loaf and giveth to them, and the fish likewise"; but no mention is made of "*breaking*³." The hypothesis that John was influenced by a mystical view of the unity of the Eucharistic food is confirmed by what Philo says concerning the dividing, and the reuniting, of the parts of the whole burnt offering which "from one, becomes many, and from many becomes one⁴." It is also favoured by the fact that John

¹ See the next section, where it will appear that Matthew obscures this difference, and Luke omits it altogether. The distinction is also clear in Mk viii. 6—7 *καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν...καὶ εἶχαν ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα· καὶ εὐλόγησας αὐτὰ* (without any mention of breaking in the case of the fishes)....

² Jn xix. 36, quoting Exod. xii. 46, Numb. ix. 12 (*συντρίβω*).

³ Jn xxi. 13. Contrast with this Lk. xxiv. 30—35 "Having taken the loaf he blessed [God] (*εὐλόγησεν*) and having broken [it] he offered [freely] (*ἑπέδιδου*) to them...how he was known by them in the breaking (*τῇ ἐλάσει*) of the loaf."

⁴ Philo ii. 241. This is preceded (*ib.* 240), and followed, by

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

(alone) tells us that in the parting of Christ's garments by the soldiers, His "coat"—a type of the Church—escaped "rending," and that in the miraculous draught of fishes, the "net"—another type of the Church—"was not rent¹."

That John would have been influenced by motives of this kind is very probable. But it is not probable (according to our experience of his Gospel hitherto) that he would have omitted this ancient tradition of "breaking" if he had not believed it to be either erroneous or, at all events, likely to give a wrong spiritual impression. There are reasons for thinking that confusion arose in early times from various interpretations of Isaiah's precept rendered by our Versions "*Deal* (Heb. *pâras*) thy bread to the hungry²." *Pâras* is nowhere rendered "deal" except in this passage. It means "*break in half*," and here, "*break in half* thy loaf for the hungry³." Ibn Ezra takes it thus. But the Talmud records a tradition that the word ought to be written as *pâras(h)*⁴. Then it might mean "separate"

mentions of εὐχαριστία, e.g. ib. 243 εὐαν βουληθῆς σὴ διανοίᾳ εὐχαριστήσαι θεῷ περὶ γενέσεως κόσμου τὴν εὐχαριστίαν....

¹ Jn xix. 24, xxi. 11 using σχίζω in both cases. Luke in his narrative of the Draught of Fishes says (v. 6) "the nets began to be torn asunder (διεμήσσοντο)."

² Is..lviii. 7 פָּרַס (but Targ. פָּרַס "sustentabis pane tuo"). Ibn Ezra says "it means here to break a loaf of bread" (and he compares Lam. iv. 4 "no man breaketh (פָּרַס not פָּרַס) to them"). Jerome *ad loc.* says "frange...non plures panes sed unum panem." "*Deal*" means "distribute"—but does not give the full Hebrew sense.

Modern emendations and modern suggestions as to what the text of Isaiah originally was, however interesting and valuable they may be, do not concern us when we are endeavouring to approximate to Jewish interpretations of the passage in the first century.

³ Gesen. 828 a "break in two," "divide" (of the divided hoof) (Lev. xi. 3 etc.). On Jerem. xvi. 7 "neither shall men break [bread] for them (לֶחֶם)," Gesen. suggests לֶחֶם "bread," instead of לֶחֶם.

⁴ *Baba Bathra* 9 a, Goldschmidt renders this "forsche nach und dann gib ihm." He adds in a note that many MSS have פָּרַס, but that the Masora on Numb. iv. 7 expressly says that פָּרַס is the right reading. Gesen. 831 gives פָּרַס = "spread out, spread," but פָּרַס

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

or "spread out." In this form it might be applied to the "spreading out" of the hands in blessing, or to the "separation" of Scripture into sections, or to its "explanation" in plain words, or to any technical "separation" in Jewish ritual¹.

The Hebrew *pâras* (used by Delitzsch in Christ's Miracles of Feeding) is particularly appropriate to meals given willingly

"make distinct, declare, New Heb. separate oneself, separate, explain."

¹ The authorities, and even the texts, so differ as to the terms פָּרַשׁ, פָּרַשׁ, and פָּרַשׁ that it is impossible here to do more than refer to what is said about them by Levy, *Levy Ch. sub voc.*, by Hor. Heb. on κλάσας in the Gospels, and by Schöttgen (in the Gospels and on 2 Tim. ii. 15). Wetstein says practically nothing. The Targumists avoid פָּרַשׁ in Is. lviii. 7, and פָּרַשׁ in Lam. iv. 4, but they retain פָּרַשׁ in Jerem. xvi. 7 "Neither shall men *break* [bread] for them in mourning," A.V. "*tear* [themselves] for them in mourning."

On this last passage Rashi has a note obscure, but most instructive, indicating the possibility of confusing פָּרַשׁ in Heb. "breaking a loaf in half" with some technical use of פָּרַשׁ in Aramaic, perhaps "spreading out the hands," referring to a benediction. He says that *pâras*, in Jeremiah, "significat fractionem" as in Dan. v. 25, 28 "*u-pharsin*," i.e. "*and divided*" (*pharsin* being a form of *pâras*). Then he adds "For with food did they refresh the mourners in the street, and they did *spread out* for them that Benediction [which is called] 'He that bringeth forth' (eisque explicabant benedictionem illam, הַמְצִיָּא)." This refers to the words of the Benediction pronounced by the father of the family, or the principal Rabbi, over the breaking of bread at a meal: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, Lord of the world, 'Thou that bringest forth [food from the earth].'"

Rashi proceeds, "Jonathan istud: 'nam ipse יִבְרַךְ,' id est, 'benedicet convivio,' Chaldaice vertit 'nam ipse פָּרַשׁ,' id est, 'frangit cibum.'" This mention of "Jonathan" refers to the Targum of "Jonathan" on 1 S. ix. 13 "he [*i.e.* Samuel] *doth bless* (יִבְרַךְ) the sacrifice," where the Targum has (lit.) "*doth break* (פָּרַשׁ) the food," which Rashi renders freely "benedicit super cibum, id est, benedictionem facit super cibo." "Bless [God] *over* (or break [? bread] *over*) the sacrifice," would be more regular; but Breithaupt rejects the insertion of "over" as erroneous. These passages establish the conclusion that the Hebrew "*bless*," in connection with food, might be expressed in Aramaic by a word that in Hebrew means "*break*."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

out of a small store to the hungry. There is another word mostly used in New Hebrew for the literal breaking of bread; but that, in the Bible, has a bad sense¹. The Talmud uses *pâras* to remind a master of a house that, at a meal in his house, he must not "pronounce the benediction" (*lit.* "divide the dividing") for "travellers," his guests, unless he eats with them, but he may do it for his family in order to accustom them to the fulfilment of the precept². Another passage—but one of doubtful meaning—uses the word *pâras* concerning a distribution of fishes to the citizens of Jerusalem³.

There is no clear indication in the Gospels that the "breaking (*pâras*)" of bread by Jesus was connected with the thought of the "explanation (*pârash*)" of the Law⁴. It is true that the Lucan narrative of the manifestation of Jesus "in the *breaking of the bread*," at Emmaus, at all events prepares the way for that manifestation by a mention of His "*interpretation*" of the sayings in the Scriptures concerning the Messiah, which is

¹ See Levy i. 251 b on פָּרַע which, as a Heb. verb, means (Gesen. 130) "cut off, break off, *gain by violence*," and, as a noun, "*gain made by violence*." That is the word used by Delitzsch about breaking bread in the narratives of the Eucharist, though he uses פָּרַע in the miracles of feeding. See p. 327, n. 1.

² See Levy Ch. ii. 294 a quoting R. haschana 29 b, and adding, as a common phrase, "the time needed to eat a פָּרַע, i.e. *half [of a loaf]*."

³ *Sanhedr.* 49 a, on 1 Chr. xi. 8, Joab "merely tasted" them and then "*distributed* (פָּרַע) to them." This suggests that, in the Feeding of the Five Thousand, "*breaking*," which John omits, might have been regarded by him as an error for "*distributing*," which he inserts. The food is called by Goldschmidt "*Fischtunke (sic) (פִּשְׁתִּינִי)* und kleine Fische (פִּשְׁתִּינִי)." But the latter (Gesen. 850 a, and Levy Ch. ii. 320 a) would seem to mean stinking fish. Hence the interpretation is doubtful. "Joab" is the distributor, and there may be irony in the description of him as attempting to feed Jerusalem with "fishes" not only "stinking," but also broken in pieces.

⁴ Onkelos uses פָּרַע in Deut. i. 5 (R.V.) "Moses began to *declare* this law," where Heb. בָּאֵר (Gesen. 91) = "make plain," "explain."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

subsequently called His "opening of the Scriptures," and the result is that "their eyes were opened and they knew him¹." But such a scriptural "opening" is connected with a word that means the opening of a door, rather than the opening or spreading out of the hand. It is frequently called "opening [with] an opening," and in that form occurs repeatedly in the Talmud where a Rabbi "opens" his discussion of some passage of Scripture by quoting another². Nevertheless Luke helps us to perceive a very real sense in which it may be maintained that beneath the narratives of miraculous feeding, and of Christ's meals with disciples before and after the Resurrection, there was originally and historically (whether we easily perceive it or not) a connection between the "breaking" of the bread of the Law, and the "opening," or "spreading out," of

¹ Lk. xxiv. 27 διερμήνευσεν, comp. ib. 32 διήνοιγεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς. In LXX, פָּתַח = ἀνοίγω in Is. xxxvii. 14, describing a literal "spreading out" of a letter before the Lord, and = διανοίγω in Prov. xxxi. 20 "she spreadeth out (A.V. stretcheth out) her hand (lit. palm) to the poor." The contextual repetition of διανοίγω in Lk. xxiv. 31 διηνοιχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί suggests a kind of play on the thought of "opening." It is repeated again, after Jesus has partaken of the broiled fish, in Lk. xxiv. 45 "then he opened (διήνοιξε) their mind." Διανοίγω occurs elsewhere in N.T. only in Mk vii. 34 "Be thou opened," Lk. ii. 23 (quoting Exod. xiii. 2 "that openeth the womb"), Acts vii. 56 "the heavens opened," xvi. 14 "whose heart the Lord opened," xvii. 3 "reasoned with them from the scriptures, opening and alleging that it behoved the Christ to suffer."

² Comp. Megill. 10 b "R. Jonathan opened the opening (פתח פתח) for this section (מתחילת, from פתח, separate) from the following [text]"—a phrase repeated about a dozen times in 10 b—11. Delitzsch uses פתח in Lk. xxiv. 32 and Acts xvii. 3 "Paul... reasoned with them from the scriptures, opening and alleging that it behoved the Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead..." Hor. Heb., Wetstein, and Schöttgen are silent as to any Hebrew authority for this use of "opening," and no satisfactory Greek authority is alleged. It might mean "opening" the discussion of, for example, the "section" in Isaiah about the Suffering Servant by quoting such passages as Hos. vi. 2 "After two days he will revive us."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the meaning of the Law, and the "opening" of the minds of the disciples to that meaning, and, at the same time, the "opening" of their hearts to the divine character of their Master and Saviour, the Bread of Life. We may illustrate this connection from a Talmudic passage that speaks of the material "breaking" of bread (*bātsa* as distinguished from Isaiah's *pāras*) and defines its spiritual object: "The Master of the House *breaks* [the bread] that he may *break* it with a good eye¹."

Now it was one of Christ's fundamental doctrines that the "eye" of His disciples must not be "evil," but must be "single," i.e. straightforwardly and lovingly fixed on God, and on Man regarded as in God, being made in God's image. It was to be an "eye" of kindness and goodness, recognising as the two great commandments of the Law, the love of God and the love of the neighbour. These two precepts, taken up and expressed in the Psalms and the Prophets, might be regarded as the relish, or flavour, of the Law, which, without them, was what we should call "dry bread." In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus might be described as taking and breaking the dry bread of the five loaves of the Law, and flavouring it, so to speak, with the *opson* of these two fishes, and distributing it to the multitudes².

It would be a fanciful but brief and not inaccurate summary of many of the charges brought by Jesus against the formalists who in His days constituted the majority of

¹ *Berach.* 46 a, a tradition of R. Jochanan in the name of Simeon ben Jochai.

² Some "breaking," or "spreading out," or "interpretation," of the Law in this sense would be included in Mark's (vi. 34) statement that Jesus "taught" the Five Thousand "many things" before feeding them with the five loaves and the two fishes. Not much importance can be attached to the traditions in *Sabb.* 116 a and *Gen. r.* (on Gen. xxvi. 17, Wü. p. 307) where it is said by Samuel Bar Nachman and by Ben Kaphra that there are seven books of the Law (see contexts).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the Pharisees, to take as our text Isaiah's ancient word, in its ancient Hebrew meaning, and to say that they modernised it by their Jewish traditions. They thought of it as inculcating the religious duty of "*spreading out*" the hands in prayer to God in heaven; but Jesus thought of it as inculcating the duty—moral and spiritual rather than religious—of "*breaking one's loaf in half*," even our single loaf, in order to give it to the spiritually, as well as the materially, "hungry."

Returning to the Fourth Gospel we may say that a great deal of evidence converges to the conclusion that John's omission of the "breaking" was due in part to various and perplexing inferences as to the nature and results of the act, though in part also to a Johannine motive, namely, the desire to avoid everything that could give rise to the notion that Christ was so "divided" as not to be always One¹.

§ 28. "*And the two fishes he divided among [them] all,*"
in Mark²

Mark, in both his narratives, makes a distinction, not made by Matthew or Luke, between the loaves and the fishes.

¹ Comp. 1 Cor. i. 13 "Is Christ divided (μεμέρισται)?"

² In the accounts of the Distribution, Mark (four times) and Luke use παρατίθημι of the food "set before" the multitude. Matthew never uses it except previously about (xiii. 24, 31) "*parables*" which Jesus "*set before*" the disciples. John here uses ὀψάριον instead of ἰχθύς for "fish."

The R.V. does not express all the shades of difference which will be found in the Greek text printed below:

(The Five Thousand)

Mk vi. 41	Mt. xiv. 19	Lk. ix. 16	Jn vi. 11
καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέ- ψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέ- κλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθη- ταῖς ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶ- σι.	καὶ... λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέ- ψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.	λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέ- ψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς παρα- θεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ.	ἔλαβεν οὖν τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εὐχαριστήσας διέδω- κεν τοῖς ἀρακειμένοις, ὁμοίως καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὅσον ἤθελεν.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

In the Five Thousand, he says that Jesus (not the disciples) "divided" the fishes. In the Four Thousand, he seems to introduce the fishes as a kind of after-thought or addition ("that they were to set *these, too*, before [the multitude]").

Moreover Mark distinguishes between "setting-before" and "dividing." "Set-before" he uses four times, and always of the action of the disciples. Jesus Himself is described by Mark as (1) "giving" to the disciples, and as (2) ordering the disciples to "set before" the people. These clauses contain no difficulty. But there is difficulty in "he divided the two fishes to all." Perhaps we may explain it from the precedent of David, who

(The Four Thousand)

Mk viii. 6—7

καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν καὶ παρέθηκεν τῷ ὄχλῳ· καὶ εἶχαν ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα· καὶ εὐλόγησας αὐτὰ εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθῆναι.

Mt. xv. 36

ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.

In Mk vi. 41, SS and Walton Syr. have "they divided" (for "he divided"), and in Mk viii. 7, codex \aleph has *prima manu* παρέθηκεν, corrected into εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθῆναι. These variations do not appear in Swete (ed. 1898).

The Diatessaron, in the Four Thousand, omits the whole of Mk viii. 7 "and they had a few little fishes; and having blessed them he said [to them] that they should set these also before [the multitude]"—except "a few little fishes," which it places earlier (as Matthew does). Thus it omits one of the Marcan mentions of παρατίθημι. On the other hand, in the Five Thousand, it mentions παρατίθημι twice (where Mark has it only once) thus: "Then Jesus said unto them, 'Bring hither those five loaves and the two fishes.' And when they brought him that, Jesus took the bread and the fish, and looked to heaven, and blessed and divided"—substituting "dividing" for "breaking-in-pieces" (κατέκλασεν) or "breaking" (κλάσαι)—"and gave to the disciples to set before them; and the disciples set for the multitudes the bread and the fish." This last clause ("set...fish") appears to come from Mk viii. 6 b "and they set [them] before the multitude," and to be a substitute for Mk vi. 41 b "and the two fishes he divided unto all."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"divided to every man of Israel" food specified in the context¹. It is not meant that David himself "set the food before" Israel, but that he specified the portion to be "divided" to each and caused it to be set before each. In Mark, the meaning may be that, whereas the loaves were broken and set before the people, "*the two fishes*" were *not* "broken," but "*divided to all*," that is, "*distributed to all, the two fishes being given to each person*." This miraculous reproduction of the two fishes for each person Mark may intend to describe as a separate act of Jesus.

In the Four Thousand, the fishes are called "little" and "few"—terms that might easily be interchanged². Also the number "two" is dropped, so that any suggestion of "two for each person" is avoided, and we may suppose them to have been multiplied not in pairs but indefinitely by Jesus who commanded that the disciples should set an indefinite number of them before the people. This hypothesis would help us to see why Mark here calls them "little-fishes"—a word not elsewhere used in N.T. or LXX. It might also explain John's peculiar addition "*and of the fishes as much as they desired*"—that is, they were not restricted to "*the two*"³.

But there is another way of explaining this Greek diminutive, as well as the use of "two." We find corresponding peculiarities in the LXX where the widow in Zarephath says to Elijah "I have...but an handful of meal...and, behold, I am gathering *two sticks*...that I may...dress it and die"⁴. "*Two*"

¹ 2 S. vi. 19 καὶ διεμέρισεν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ..., 1 Chr. xvi. 3 καὶ διεμέρισεν παντὶ ἀνδρὶ Ἰσραὴλ....

² In Mt. xv. 34, SS and Curet. have different words for "few" (Burk. "a few fishes," Walton "aliquot pisces minutos"), and in Mk viii. 7, Burk. and Walton have "a few fishes."

³ Some reasons for John's preference of ὀψάριον to ἰχθύς here are given in *Proclam.* p. 86. Also, if John had used ἰχθύς, he would have seemed to prefer it to ἰχθύδιον. As it is, he puts both the Synoptic terms aside, introducing one of his own.

⁴ 1 K. xvii. 12 "two (שְׁנַיִם) sticks (עֵצִים)," δύο ξυλάρια. This is 330. (Mark vi. 29—44)

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

is here uniquely used in O.T. for "*a very few*¹." The Greek translators, feeling in a confused way that scantiness—not small number—is implied by "*two*," and yet not liking to suppress the literal meaning, compromise by rendering the Hebrew "*sticks*" into a Greek diminutive ("two little-sticks") nowhere else found in LXX.

Mark seems to have done something of the same kind but not so accurately as the LXX. In the Five Thousand he takes "two" literally, and explains it as the literal answer to a question of Jesus "How many loaves have ye?" They answer "five, and two fishes," though nothing was asked about the fishes². In the Four Thousand, writing in his own person, Mark does not venture to say "*They had two fishes*." This would have been as inappropriate as it would have been for the narrator of the story of the Widow to write in his own person that "*she was gathering two sticks*." Such hyperbole, allowable in a complainant, is not allowable in a historian. So Mark paraphrases "two" by "a few." Yet he might well feel that this was unsatisfactory. "A few fish" might naturally mean more, not less, than "two fish," and thus the wonder of the miracle would be impaired. So Mark compromises by changing "fishes" into "little fishes."

John shews us dramatically how the "two" and the "five" might have originated in the expostulation of a single disciple like Andrew, who exclaims "There is a lad here with five

the only instance of *ξύλαριον* in LXX, but *γῦ* = *ξύλον* nearly 250 times. The translators felt that "*two*," like "*handful*," implied some kind of minuteness, and this they expressed by the diminutive *ξύλαρια* while retaining "*two*."

¹ Gesen. 1041 *a* gives no other instance but this where "*two*" is thus used (without the juxtaposition of "three" (or "one") as in "two or three").

² Matthew and Luke go back more closely to the original by representing the "five" and the "two" to be part of a remonstrance on the part of the disciples, somewhat like that of the widow of Zarephath.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

barley loaves and *two opsaria*; but what are these among so many?" It should be noted that John never mentions the fishes as "two" when writing in his own person, as the Synoptists do. He mentions "the five barley loaves" thus¹, but not "the two fishes."

As to the Synoptic distinction—expressed in various ways—between the giving by Christ to the disciples, and the giving by the disciples to the multitudes, John puts this aside. He represents Jesus as Himself "distributing"—like David, who in an instance above mentioned², is said to have "distributed" to all Israel³. John rejects the Synoptic word "*set-before* [*the people*]" although it is associated in LXX with the thought of Abraham "setting before" the Three his hospitable food⁴, a hospitality for which (according to Jewish tradition) requital was made by God, in every detail, to Abraham's descendants.

Lastly—when describing Jesus as "distributing"—John does not use Mark's word "divide." Perhaps he felt that, for Greeks, it might suggest the thought of "divided in dissension," as when Paul says to the Corinthians "Is Christ *divided*?"⁵ At

¹ Jn vi. 13.

² See above, pp. 329—30.

³ Mk vi. 41, Lk. ix. 16 *ἔδιδον* (Mt. xiv. 19 *ἔδωκεν*) τοῖς μαθηταῖς followed by Mk *ἰδίως* *ἐμέρισεν* πᾶσιν, compared with Jn vi. 11 *διέδωκεν* τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις, may be illustrated by Gen. xlix. 27 *רָחֵף* (Field) "dividet, LXX *δίδομι* (potior scriptura *διαδώσει*), Aq. *μερίσει*." This exhibits the same three variations that we find in N.T. (1) "give (*δίδομι*)," (2) "give separately (*διαδίδομι*)," (3) "divides (*μερίζω*)."

⁴ Gen. xviii. 8 *παρέθηκεν*. There it = Heb. "gave before their faces." In Exod. xix. 7 *παρέθηκεν* αὐτοῖς πάντας τοὺς λόγους (and *ib.* xxi. 1), it = Heb. "set before their faces." See Gesen. 817 *b* which says that both "give" and "set" are thus used of food, but that "give before the face" usually means "propound," and is applied to laws. Matthew (see above, p. 328, n. 2) uses *παράθεμι* only about parables.

Comp. 2 K. iv. 43 "Am I to set this before an hundred men?"—which is the exclamation of Elisha's servant—and *ib.* 44 "so he set it before them." John passes over this intermediate act of service.

⁵ 1 Cor. i. 13 *μεμίσται ὁ Χριστός*; *Μερίζω* denotes "divided by conflict" in Mk iii. 24 etc.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

all events he chooses an ambiguous word that may mean either (1) "give in turn what one has received" or (2) "give to separate persons¹." The word is hardly used in LXX, but may very well represent the Hebrew "*apportion*," while at the same time the Greek reader receives from it the suggestion that the Son is here giving in turn to men something that He has Himself received from the Father. This is confirmed by Christ's subsequent words "My Father *giveth* you the true bread out of heaven" and "*I am the bread of life*"—when taken with a previous utterance "As the Father hath life in himself, even so *gave he to the Son* also to have life in himself²." The Son, giving Himself utterly to the Giver of eternal life, the Father in heaven, receives from Him power to become the Bread of Life for the Father's children on earth.

In connection with the multiplication of the fishes, the following facts indicate that it might have a Messianic allusiveness in the Galilaean Church. The New Hebrew and Aramaic for "fish," *nun*, though non-existent in the Bible as a noun, occurs once as a verb (*yinnon* or *jinnon*), meaning literally "*shall abound with offspring*," thus, "His name *shall-abound-with-offspring* (Field *sobolescet*, Walton *filiabitur*) before the sun³." On the Hebrew "*shall abound*," *Jinnon*, Schöttgen says "It means 'shall be multiplied like fishes.' But the

¹ *διαδίδωμι* (= Heb. word) occurs only in Gen. xlix. 20, 27 (A), and Josh. xiii. 6 (LXX). In Genesis it = נתן and חלק, and B has (*bis*) δίδωμι. For *διαδίδωμι* = "give in succession" see Steph. Thes. ii. 1139. Goodspeed gives *διαδίδωμι* only in Hermas Sim. v. 2. 9 where the faithful servant, having received *εἰδοματα* from his Master, "distributes" some of them to his fellow-servants.

² Jn vi. 32, 35, v. 26.

³ Ps. lxxii. 17 R.V. txt "*shall be continued*," marg. "*shall have issue*." The Biblical Heb. for "fish" is דג (Aram. נון). The verb דג occurs but once (Gesen. 185 b), Gen. xlviii. 16 R.V. "*grow-into-a-multitude*," where A.V. marg. says "(Heb.) *as fishes do increase*," and Onkelos has "increase like the fishes (נוני) of the sea."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Jews took it as a *proper name*¹." This, though over-stated, is confirmed by several passages in Midrash and Talmud, which indicate that in poetic traditions the Jews regarded *Jinnon*, in this Psalm, as one of the names of the Messiah existent before the Creation². Now the preceding verse says "There shall be *abundance* (marg. *an handful*) of corn in the earth on the top of the mountains³"; and on the word rendered "abundance" Rashi says "Our rabbis expound it as meaning *cakes in the days of the Messiah, and the whole of this Psalm they explain as being about the King Messiah*⁴."

The Jewish Commentary on the Psalms quotes a tradition of this kind as going back to R. Jochanan: "The land of Israel will *bring forth little round cakes*⁵." The commentary does not quote any corresponding tradition about "*Jinnon*," that the waters of Israel "will bring forth a multitude of little fishes," or that the Messiah "will multiply fishes." But it is not difficult to see that such a tradition would be likely to find favour in the first century among the Jews and especially among the fishermen and others who dwelt round the sea of Galilee. The commentary on Numbers called *Siphri* says "There went with Israel in the wilderness a well, and supplied fat fishes more than their need required⁶." The "well" was believed to flow from a "rock" that "followed" Israel; and

¹ Schöttgen ii. 20. This is not universally true, for the Targum has "*was prepared* before the sun," perhaps (like the LXX) having a different reading; and Rashi takes it as meaning "kingdom" and "empire." Gesen. 630 *b* suggests that the original may have been יָבִיחַ "be established," "endure," LXX has διαμνέει.

² See Levy ii. 246 *a* quoting three passages, and Schöttg. ii. 240 quoting others.

³ Ps. lxxii. 16, see Gesen. 821 *a*.

⁴ Rashi himself explains the word as meaning either "additionem et multitudinem" or "beneplacitum."

⁵ *Tehill.* ad loc. mentions R. Chija bar Asi as uttering it "in the name of R. Jochanan" (who lived in the time of Vespasian).

⁶ *Siphri* on Numb. xi. 22.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

according to Paul, "the rock was Christ¹." In proportion as Christianity advanced, such traditions about "fishes," or "loaves," or "round cakes" of the Messiah, would fall into disrepute among the Jews, as having a Christian sound. I have not found Jochanan's tradition quoted elsewhere, although many passages in Midrash and Talmud refer to the verse in the Psalms. But, if it was avoided because of its resemblance to Christian traditions, the same motive may explain the silence of Jewish tradition about multiplication of fishes in Messianic times².

¹ 1 Cor. x. 4.

² In view of the very early use of the Greek *ichthys*, "fish," to denote by means of the letters *i, ch, th, u, s*, "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour (or, Crucified)"—see *Orac. Sibyll.* viii. 217 foll.—it may be of interest to note the very different use made by the Jews of *שׁ*, the initial letter of "שׁוּשׁ," "fish." They called attention to the fact that *שׁ* and the two next letters of the alphabet (*ב, ד, פ*) were initial letters of (1) *פִּשׁ* "fish," (2) *רִפּוּי* "remedy," (3) *עַיִן* "eye," thus indicating that "fish" was a "remedy" for the "eye" (as it is in Tobit xi. 4—11).

Also the Jewish dependence on fish for a sumptuous meal in which they were to "honour" the [Friday] evening preceding the Great Sabbath is illustrated by a story (Levy iii. 360, *Gen. r.*, Wü. p. 47) about a Jewish tailor, who ventured to outbid the servant of "a ruler" in Rome by buying a fish, the only one in the shop, for twelve denarii. The ruler called the tailor before him to explain his conduct. "My lord," said the tailor, "it is a day on which all our sins, which we have committed during the whole year, are to be forgiven. When such a day comes *ought we not to honour it?*"

It is worth noting that in the Double Tradition of Matthew (vii. 9—11) and Luke (xi. 11—13) where Jesus wishes to describe the willingness of the Father in heaven to give (Mt.) "good [things]" or (Lk.) "the Holy Spirit," to those that ask Him, the one metaphor in which Matthew and Luke agree (according to the text of W. H.) is that in which the good gift is represented by "a fish" (as the opposite of "a serpent"). For the rest (Mt. "bread...stone," Lk. "egg...scorpion") they disagree.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 29. "Twelve basketfuls" (R.V.), in Mark¹

Of the differences between the parallel columns printed below, one has been discussed incidentally above, namely, the Synoptic use of the verb "satisfied" (literally "foddered") where John has "filled²." Mark's phrase "and of [Gk *from*] the fishes" may either be taken with "broken pieces" so as to mean "and [broken pieces] of the fishes," or with "some," understood, so as to mean "and [some] of the fishes³." The frequent use of the Hebrew "*from*" to mean "*some of*" decidedly favours the latter interpretation here; and so does the Johannine use of "from" in the saying of Jesus to the

¹ Mk vi. 42—3
(R.V.)

(42) And they did all eat, and were filled (*ἐχορτάσθησαν*).

(43) And they took up broken pieces, twelve basketfuls (*κοφίνων πληρώματα*), and also of the fishes.

Mt. xiv. 20
(R.V.)

(20) And they did all eat, and were filled (*ἐχορτάσθησαν*): and they took up that which remained over of the broken pieces, twelve baskets full (*κοφίνους πλήρεις*).

Lk. ix. 17
(R.V.)

(17) And they did eat, and were all filled (*ἐχορτάσθησαν*): and there was taken up that which remained over to them of broken pieces, twelve baskets (*κόφιναι*).

Jn vi. 12—13
(R.V.)

(12) And when they were filled (*ἐπεπληρώθησαν*), he saith unto his disciples, Gather up the broken pieces which remain over, that nothing be lost.

(13) So they gathered them up, and filled twelve baskets (*κοφίνους*) with broken pieces from the five barley loaves, which remained over unto them that had eaten.

Mk viii. 8 (R.V.)

And they did eat, and were filled (*ἐχορτάσθησαν*); and they took up, of broken pieces that remained over, seven baskets (*σφυρίδας*).

Mt. xv. 37 (R.V.)

And they did all eat, and were filled (*ἐχορτάσθησαν*): and they took up that which remained over of the broken pieces, seven baskets full (*σφυρίδας πλήρεις*).

² See above, p. 306 foll.

³ Gesen. 580 *b*, *inter alia*, quotes Exod. xvi. 27 "there went out [some] from the people" (where LXX inserts *τινές*), Lev. xxv. 49 "[some one] from the kinsfolk may redeem it," LXX ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων...λυτρώσεται, which would naturally be rendered "redeem from the kinsfolk."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

seven fishermen after Christ's resurrection "Bring [some] of (lit. from) the fish that ye have now caught¹."

A more important point is the ambiguity of the Marcan "they took up," referring to the broken pieces. Grammatically, "they" would mean the previously mentioned "all," that is to say, the multitude. Luke—in accordance with Mark's vague use of "they" in such phrases as "they say" to mean a passive ("it is said")—substitutes a passive "there was taken up." John defines the agents with remarkable distinctness, not only assigning the act to the disciples but adding that Jesus gave express commandment to them to perform it: "Gather ye the broken-pieces that have superabounded that nothing may be lost²."

Here, if "crumbs" falling from the food had been meant, the Greek word for "crumbs" used in Christ's Dialogue with the Syrophenician woman might have been employed³. Nor would any form of the word "superabundant" (in Greek, *perissos*) have been needed⁴. On the other hand, to suppose that the meaning is "portions deliberately broken off," and that Jesus broke them off, raises the question, "Is it likely that John would represent Jesus as breaking off 'superabundant' pieces, so as to cause waste?" The difficulty might lead us to conclude

¹ Jn xxi. 10 Ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὧν ἐπιάσατε νῦν. Chrys. retains "from," κελύει ἐκ τῶν ὀ. ἐνεγκεῖν, but Nonnus (ἄφαρ...νερό-δων...ἄγλην) drops it. The context does not shew why "the fishes" might not have been mentioned instead of "some of the fishes," nor why the latter is expressed in an idiom unusual except in Hebraic Greek. After Christ's command, Peter "went on board and drew the net to land full of great fishes." It may be implied, but it is not stated, that he "brought [some] of them" to Jesus as specimens and proofs of success.

² Jn vi. 12 Συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα.

³ Mk vii. 28, Mt. xv. 27 ψιχία, on which see Levy iv. 140 a and Pes. 10 b describing a "child" as "crumbling his bread."

⁴ Some form of περισσεύειν is used by Mt., Lk., and Jn in the Five Thousand, and by Mt. in the Four Thousand, but περισσεύματα by Mk in the Four Thousand.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

—especially as John has not described Jesus as “breaking” the bread—that the multitude are to be regarded as wastefully breaking off from their portions large “pieces” too big to be called “crumbs,” and that John meant such “pieces” as these. This would accord with Origen’s view that it is the unworthiness of the multitude that prevents them from consuming all the nourishment provided for them¹.

But these arguments may be misleading unless supplemented by the probability (we may almost say the certainty) that John is influenced by the words of Elisha over the barley loaves, “Thus saith the Lord, They shall eat and *they shall cause to superabound or leave thereof*,” that is to say, “*They shall be satisfied and shall have a superfluity*”². This saying about the barley loaves of Elisha, if applied to the Johannine barley loaves of Jesus, might meet the objection “The Lord could not have broken more pieces than were needed.” The mystical answer might be, in John’s words, “He knew what he would do,” that is to say, “He knew that what was apparent waste would not be waste, because it would come back as in a future ‘gathering together,’ so that ‘nothing should be lost’.” In this sense, the pieces that were broken were *not* “more than were needed,” if the lesson of the sign was to be fully taught. It was intended that some of the food should be “left,” or that there should be a “*superabundance*.”

These remarks may explain why Mark (alone of the Evangelists) omits, in his Feeding of the Five Thousand, all mention

¹ Origen *Comm. Matt.* xi. 19 (Lomm. iii. 125). The four thousand are superior to the five thousand, and “more receptive (*χωρητικώτεροι*)” (comp. Jn viii. 37 *ὃν χωρεῖ*) so that they leave less unconsumed.

² 2 K. iv. 43—44. The verb יָתַר, “leave,” may mean “leave as a remnant saved from destruction,” but it may also mean “leave as superfluous”; and forms of יָתַר = *περισσεύω* about 13 times, and *περισσός* more than 20 times.

³ Jn vi. 12. What the Jews rejected might be regarded as coming back to the Apostles in the form of a “gathering” of the Gentiles (see Rom. xi. 15—32).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

of "*superabundance*," and substitutes, literally, "*fillings*," in a curious phrase rendered by R.V. "*basketfuls*," but by A.V. "*baskets full*¹"; Matthew has the latter, "*baskets full*," but retains "*superabundant*²"; Luke makes no mention of "*full*" in any form, but has "*superabundant*³." The explanation suggested is, that the Hebrew "*left*," or "*superabounding*," twice repeated in the miracle of Elisha, was taken by Mark in the Feeding of the Five Thousand as meaning "*running over*" or "*quite full*⁴." By taking it thus, the charge of imputing to Jesus a superfluous multiplication of food would be somewhat softened⁵.

Luke inserts the dative "*to them*" after "*superabounded*." John inserts a similar dative, but one of a much more special kind—"to those who had consumed [the food]⁶." This Greek word "*consume* [food]"—meaning in literary Greek "*gnaw*," "*eat up*," and often applied to eating raw flesh, etc.—occurs in LXX fairly often to represent the ordinary Hebrew

¹ Mk vi. 43 κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων, A.V. "twelve baskets full of the fragments, and of the fishes." "*The fragments*" suggests "*the fragments* that would naturally fall from such a meal." But there is no "*the*." The literal rendering is "broken pieces, fillings of twelve baskets, and of (*lit.* from) the fishes."

² Mt. xiv. 20 τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις, "that which was [found] superabounding of the broken pieces, twelve baskets [quite] full," where "*full*" is emphasized by its position.

³ Lk. ix. 17 τὸ περισσεύσαν αὐτοῖς κλασμάτων κόφιναι δώδεκα, "that which was [found] superabounding by them (*or*, for them) of broken pieces, baskets [precisely] twelve," where "*twelve*" is emphasized by its position.

⁴ Πλήρωμα occurs rather rarely (15 times) in LXX. It corresponds to Heb. "*full*." Cant. v. 12 "*channels of waters*" is paraphrased as "*fillings* (πληρώματα) of waters" to express full-flowing streams. Much more defensibly might the Heb. "*left*," ית, be thus paraphrased.

⁵ Note however that Mark does not avoid περισσεύματα in Mk viii. 8 (the Four Thousand).

⁶ Jn vi. 13 τοῖς βεβρωκόσιν.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"eat," but mostly in a bad sense. In the Prophets it refers to the devouring effect of fire, rust, or blight, or the eating of food defiled or offered to idols. In Genesis it does not occur once. But in Exodus and Leviticus it is frequent, occurring about ten times in prohibitions ("this shall not be eaten") (as well as positively). For our purposes, however, the two points of special importance are that (1) it occurs for the first time in connection with the Paschal Lamb, of which it is said "It shall be *consumed* in one house," and that (2) this follows the precept "Ye shall cause none of it to *superabound* (lit. *be left over and above*) till the morning¹."

Do not these facts go some way toward justifying what at first sight seems the wild imagination of Origen—namely, that a fault of non-receptiveness is implied in those who "leave broken pieces"? May it not be that John had in view both *dicta*:—(1) that of the Law "Ye shall cause none of it to *superabound*," and (2) that of Elisha "They shall cause to *superabound*"? At all events John would probably regard the "superabounding" as divinely ordained in order that remnants from the Bread of the Gospel, rejected by the unbelievers among the Jews, might pass to the Gentiles; and yet, as in the Epistle to the Romans, the rejection would be regarded as a fault in the Jews, who did not discern, and receive in its entirety, the Living Bread, which was also the Paschal Lamb.

Jerome calls Christ's distribution of bread "a sowing of food," and implies, somewhat obscurely, that the food was "divided into (*or* with a view to) a manifold harvest²." About the distribution, the following comment has been preserved as coming from Ammonius: "He [*i.e.* Jesus] did not give

¹ Exod. xii. 10 "ye shall let none of it remain," Exod. xii. 46 "it shall be eaten (*βρωθήσεται*)." The word for "superabound" is *נותר*, the same as that in 2 K. iv. 43—44.

² Jerome, on Mt. xiv. 19, "Frangente Domino, *seminarium fit ciborum*. Si enim fuissent integri...nec divisi in *multiplicem segetem*...."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

[the food] to the multitudes to carry (?), but to the disciples, since He above all things desired to train these—the destined teachers of the world. For the multitude was not destined to receive any great fruit from the miracle (*lit.* wonder). For they straightway forgot it and began to ask for another miracle (*lit.* wonder). But these [*i.e.* the disciples] were destined to receive no common gain¹." This appears to express at all events an important part of John's meaning. The first harvest was, so to speak, a failure—the harvest for the multitude, the Five Thousand, that is, for Israel after the flesh. The second harvest—the gathering of the fragments by the Apostles, regarded as their harvest by Ammonius—was not a failure. It was the harvest of souls to be subsequently gathered by the Twelve, who (in spite of Judas) were typical of the Twelve Tribes of Israel after the Spirit. The key to the Johannine meaning lies in the words of Jesus "that nothing may be lost"—a phrase peculiar (with slight variations) to the Fourth

¹ Cramer p. 243 on Jn vi. 13. The words οὐκ ἔδωκε δὲ τοῖς ὄχλοις βαστάζειν ἀλλὰ τοῖς μαθηταῖς somewhat resemble a passage from Origen's commentary on Mt. xiv. 16 (quoted below, p. 356) where Origen applies φέρειν to the disciples. And Origen there, like Ammonius here, uses παιδεύω to describe Jesus as "training" the disciples through the miracle of the Five Thousand. But Origen represents Jesus as saying, in effect, to the disciples, "I have trained you to give the Bread. Now give it." Ammonius—much more accordantly with Johannine doctrine—regards the "training" as now going on in the course of this miracle ("since he especially desired to train these (ἰκεῖν μάλιστα τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐβούλετο)"). And Ammonius speaks of the disciples, not as "teaching" but as "destined to be teachers (τοὺς μέλλοντας ἵσθαι διδασκάλους)." Ammonius meets the objection that Judas received a basketful by saying that, as the rest of the Twelve received "no ordinary gain," so Judas received "no ordinary condemnation when he carried the basket (ἦν δὲ καὶ τῷ Ἰούδα κατάκριμα τὸ γινόμενον οὐ τὸ τυχόν, βαστάζοντι τὸν κόφινον)." Does Ammonius mean, in his first sentence, "He did not give to the multitudes [the right] to carry (βαστάζειν) [the baskets of fragments] but to the disciples," and does he, in the last, allude to Jn xii. 6 "[Judas] (R.V. marg.) carried (ἐβάσταξεν)..."?

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Gospel, and used to describe something corresponding to what the Prophets call the "remnant" of Israel¹.

As regards Mark's ambiguous words "and from the fishes" John intervenes, at least negatively, so far as to indicate that there were no fishes or fragments of fishes in the twelve baskets. The baskets were "filled [to the top] from the five barley-loaves²." According to his view, the fishes that Mark described as being "taken up" were not placed in the twelve baskets. They must have been brought to Jesus, if at all, separately.

As to the difference between the "twelve *cophinoi*" filled in the earlier miracle, and the "seven *sphurides*" filled in the later one, we have seen above³ that a distinction between kinds of "baskets" is recognised by Jewish Tradition in connection with the "basket" of firstfruits which is made the subject of a kind of votive hymn in Deuteronomy⁴. Philo paraphrases this hymn in a fragment of a treatise on the Feast of Baskets in which he says that it was celebrated "*on two seasons*" of the year⁵. But Rashi says expressly "*once in the year, not twice*⁶." In this, he is following the Talmud, which says "Firstfruits

¹ Comp. Jn iii. 16 ἵνα...μὴ ἀπόληται, vi. 12 ἵνα μὴ τι ἀπόληται, vi. 39 ἵνα...μὴ ἀπολείσω, x. 28 οὐ μὴ ἀπόλωνται, xvii. 12 οὐδεὶς...ἀπώλετο εἰ μὴ..., xviii. 9 οὐκ ἀπώλεσα.

² John expresses Mark's πληρώματα, Mt. πλήρεις, Lk. om., by (vi. 13) ἐγέμισαν, using the same word that he used before (ii. 7 bis) in the miracle of Cana, to describe the waterpots as "filled to the top."

³ See above, pp. 208—9.

⁴ Deut. xxvi. 2—4 "Thou shalt put it in a basket... the priest shall take the basket," LXX κάρταλλον, Aq. ἀγγεῖον. The Heb. occurs (Gesen. 380 b) only there and *ib.* xxviii. 5, 17 LXX ἀποθήκαι.

⁵ See Philo *post* ii. 298 ἔστι δὲ τις παρὰ ταῦτα ἑορτὴ μὲν θεοῦ, ἑορτῆς δὲ πανήγυρις ἦν καλοῦσι Κάρταλλον... § 3 τὸ ἔσμα τοῦτο (*i.e.* Deut. xxvi. 5—15) ἔθεται δυοὶ καιροῖς.

⁶ On Deut. xxvi. 3 Rashi says "una vice in anno, non vero bis," and (on *ib.* 10) "non... nisi a fine septem septimanarum," *i.e.* from the end of the week of weeks which introduced the Feast of Pentecost.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

are *not to be offered before Pentecost*¹." The Targum on Deuteronomy paraphrases "basket" by three words, and the LXX renders "basket" in a later passage of Deuteronomy by "receptacles". Also a Jewish distinction is made between these "baskets" when made of metal and when made of twigs or similar material².

Pseudo-Jerome says "The seven *sportae* (i.e. *sphurides*) are the first seven Churches. The broken pieces of bread are the mystical perceptions belonging to the first Pentecost³." This mention of "Pentecost" connects the Christian narrative with the "baskets" in Deuteronomy, according to the Rabbinical view adopted by Rashi ("not before Pentecost"), and with the Symposium of the Therapeutae described by Philo as honouring not only the seventh day but also the square of seven, i.e. the eve of Pentecost⁴. On the other hand, Philo's mention of "two seasons" indicates another view in accordance with which there might be "two" Symposia, one of a rudimentary character. Such a rudimentariness would be symbolized by "barley," which, as we have seen, John alone mentions in connection with the Feeding of the Five Thousand.

¹ *Biccurim* (Mishna) i. 3 quoted by Wagenseil (*Sota* p. 661).

² On Dent. xxvi. 3 the three words of Targ. Jer. I are rendered by Walton (1) "canistra," (2) "sportulas," (3) "cophinos papyraceos." In Dent. xxviii. 5, 17, LXX has ἀποθήκαι.

³ So *Tosephoth* quoted by Wagenseil (*Sota* p. 662). *J. Biccurim* (Mishna) iii. 8 says "The rich offered their firstfruits in κάλαθοι plated with gold and silver." Levy ii. 168 a gives כּוּב (the Deuteronomic "basket") as "ein grosses, metallenes Gefäss" and quotes *j. Sota* ix. 24 b "a leaden receptacle full of barley bran."

⁴ On Mk viii. 1 foll. "Septem panes dona sunt septem Spiritus Sancti. Quatuor millia annus est Novi Testamenti cum quatuor temporibus. Septem sportae primae septem Ecclesiae. Fragmenta panum mystici intellectus primae septimanæ sunt," i.e. they are the outpourings of "mystical understanding (or, perception)," with the gift of tongues, recorded in Acts ii. 1 foll.

⁵ Philo ii. 481 οὐ μόνον τὴν ἀπλὴν ἑβδομάδα ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν δύναμιν [i.e. the power or square of the hebdomad] τεθηπότες... ἵσται δὲ προσόρτιος μεγίστης ἐορτῆς, ἣν πεντηκοστὰς ἑλάχεν.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

At this stage, the following objection may be raised: "John is supposed to regard the Feeding of the Five Thousand as rudimentary. Mark is supposed to relate the Feeding of the Four Thousand as a miracle of an advanced character. Luke omits the latter. According to the rule of Johannine Intervention, John ought to insert it. But he does not. Is not the rule broken?"

We reply that the rule is not broken because John does insert a second miracle of feeding, and that, too, "of an advanced character." Only John, as often, does not repeat what is in Mark but adds something corresponding to what is in Mark. This John places after the Resurrection. Whereas Mark symbolizes the advance by a change from the Jewish *cophinos*¹ to the Gentile *sphuris* or *sporta*, John symbolizes it in a different way by representing Jesus as feeding seven disciples from one loaf (*artos*) and one fish after they have caught and presented to Him an offering of "a hundred and fifty-three" fishes. Through that mystic number, representing the Law merged in the Spirit², and through the context as a whole, John leads us to see, in that final meal after the Resurrection, a type of divine Unity working through human multitudinousness, so as to lift mankind above Jewish and Gentile distinctions, bringing about for all alike the fulfilment of Christ's promise about the one "bread" or "loaf": "The *bread* (*artos*) that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world³."

§ 30. "*They that ate the loaves,*" in Mark⁴

Instead of the past participle Matthew has the present participle of a different verb (*esthicein*) never used by John,

¹ The connection of *cophinus* with *Judaeus* twice by Juvenal iii. 14, vi. 542, justifies our regarding it as being thus connected in the minds of Gentile readers of the Gospels in the first century.

² See *Joh. Gr.* 2283 c.

³ Jn vi. 51.

⁴ Mk vi. 44 *οἱ φάγοντες τοὺς ἄρτους*, Mt. xiv. 21 *οἱ δὲ ἐσθίωντες*.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

but used by the Synoptists in discussions about eating and in the narratives of the Eucharist where a past tense is not required¹. We have seen above that John here uses about the eaters a word ("consume") that seemed to allude to the eating of the Paschal Lamb². This hypothesis of allusion will be confirmed if we can shew that John had some reason, or at all events some consistent method, in his avoidance of *esthlein*.

This is shewn by a passage where John represents Jesus as quoting from the Psalms "He that *eateth* my bread lifted up his heel against me³." Here the LXX uses *esthlein*. But John uses a word signifying "*chew* (*trōgein*)," which occurs nowhere in the LXX and only once in N.T. outside the Fourth Gospel⁴. In that single instance—which occurs in Matthew's description of the luxurious feeding (lit. "*chewing* and drinking") in the days of Noah—the parallel Luke has the ordinary *esthlein*⁵. This is easily intelligible, but why should John—

The latter might be rendered "the eaters," the former "those that had eaten the loaves." For the parallels, see below, p. 348, n. 3.

¹ See *Joh. Voc.* 1680 b. *φαγεῖν* is freq. in the Synoptists and fairly freq. in Jn, but Jn never uses *ἐσθίειν*. The difference between *ἐσθίειν* and *φαγεῖν* is often simply a difference of tense, i.e. of time, *ἐσθίειν* having no aorist, and *φαγεῖν* no present or imperfect.

² See pp. 339—40.

³ Jn xiii. ἰδὲ ὁ τρώγων μου τὸν ἄρτον. Nonnus has *ἔρεττον*, a word applied to horses, geese, fishes, feeding in multitudes, but applicable to men with a notion of greediness.

⁴ *Τρώγω* is mostly used with an object. But it is frequently used without an object where the juxtaposition of "drinking" makes the meaning clear. Steph. *Thes.* quotes *πίνειν καὶ τρώγειν* from Demosth. p. 402, 21, and Plutarch *Mor.* 716 E, and *τρώγειν καὶ πίνειν* from *ib.* 613 B.

⁵ Mt. xxiv. 38 *τρώγοντες καὶ πίνοντες* (Lk. xvii. 27 *ἔσθιον, ἔπινον*) describing the revels of those on whom the deluge came. *Τρώγω*, "chew," is applied in various contexts to feeding on uncooked food. In Mt., it means "chewing" delicacies that might be called "dessert," where "eat for pleasure" would express the meaning, as in *Hermas Sim.* v. 3 "Take only bread and water, and give in alms from your *delicacies* that you were intending (lit.) to *chew* (*τρώγειν*)"

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

without any justification derivable from the Hebrew text of Scripture—represent Jesus as quoting from the Psalms the words “He that *cheweth* my bread”?

The following explanation is obscurely suggested by Jerome's commentary on the Psalm, and (more clearly) by Origen's commentary on earlier passages in the Gospel where John represents Jesus as using the word “chew¹.” Jerome says that Judas “was receiving celestial food...and distributing it to others².” Origen, when commenting on what he calls the “paraphrase” of the Psalm as quoted by Jesus, says that the bread referred to was “most nourishing³.” Elsewhere, in his treatise on the daily bread in the Lord's Prayer, he takes in order the passages in which Jesus speaks of the need of His disciples to “*chew*” His flesh and “*drink*” His blood, and not only repeats the epithet “nourishing” again, but adds to it others such as “solid,” and “athletic⁴.” Taken together, Origen's remarks confirm the view that the language of Christians about the Eucharist might give rise, even as early as the days of Nero, to a popular belief that they practised in their “mysteries” the eating of human flesh⁵.

i.e. to eat for pleasure. In other contexts it might mean “*chew* (a crust)” and be applied to a beggar. See Steph. *Thes.* τρώγω, which shews that the grammarians expressly distinguish τρώγω, as having a more particular meaning than ἔσθιω, and as being applied to the eating of τραγήματα, “sweetmeats.”

¹ Jn vi. 54, 56, 57, 58. In all these, Jesus is speaking. John never uses τρώγω in his own person.

² Jerome on Ps. xli. 9.

³ Origen on Jn xiii. 18 (Lomm. ii. 419) παραπέφρασται, (*ib.* 420) τροφιστάτων.

⁴ Origen *De Orat.* § 27 (Lomm. xvii. 205 foll.) leads us from δ τροφίμος λόγος to the thought of its στεργρότης and εἰσωνία, as being ἀθλητική τροφή distinguishing it from “manna” and “milk.”

⁵ See p. 398 foll. If this was so, John might indirectly vindicate the Christians, and also teach the true doctrine of Christ, by representing Him as using spiritual language about His flesh and blood, which was misunderstood at first even by His own disciples.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

A close examination of the Greek justifies Origen. Neither the Latin, nor the Syriac, nor the English Versions represent the abruptness with which the word "*chewing*" is as it were thrown in the faces of the Jews by the Fourth Gospel after they have said "How can this [man] give us his flesh to *eat* (*phagein*)?" It is true that Jesus is made to reply at first with a repetition of their word ("Except ye *eat* (*phagein*) the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves"). But He immediately adds "He that *cheweth* (*trōgein*) my flesh and drinketh my blood hath life eternal.... He that *cheweth* (*trōgein*) my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him. As the living Father sent me and I live because of the Father, [so] also he that *cheweth* (*trōgein*) me—he too shall live because of me. This is the bread that came down from Heaven. Not as the fathers *ate* (*phagein*) [manna] and died¹—[not so is it now]; he that *cheweth* (*trōgein*) this bread shall live for ever²."

These last words, contrasting the death that came after Israel "*ate*" the manna with the life that will belong to him that "*cheweth*" the "bread" that "came down from heaven," should be illustrated from Israel's complaint about the manna that it had no sustaining moisture for them. "Our soul is *dried away*," they cried, and "who shall give us *flesh* to eat³?" The Fourth Gospel represents Jesus as affording to the spiritual Israel a food of spiritual nature that should satisfy both hunger and thirst. It was to be the "*flesh*" of the living Son, which

¹ "Died." See Numb. xiv. 30 "save Caleb... and Joshua."

² Jn vi. 52—8. Our English Versions have "*eat*" throughout, and so have the Syriac. The Latin Versions vary somewhat strangely; *d* renders φαγεῖν by "manducare" in 52 and 58 (where *d* has "non sicut manducaverunt (ἔφαγον)... qui manducat (ἐσθίειν).") Chrysostom, commenting on this passage, makes no comment on the transition in Jn from φαγεῖν to ἐσθίειν.

³ Numb. xi. 4—6 נָחַם. Comp. Ps. lxxviii. 20 "Will he provide *flesh* (שָׂרָף)," LXX τρέφειν, where Rashi says that נָחַם (which rather suggests flesh with blood in it, Gesen. 984—5) stands for נָחַם.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

could not possibly be received apart from the reception of His blood. Isaiah invites the soul to "eat" the food of heaven as being "wine" and "milk," not mentioning, but assuming, that it included "bread¹." So John connects the life and being of the Son with "bread" and with "flesh," and even with "blood," not mentioning, but assuming, that this included "wine²."

§ 31. "*Five thousand men*" or "*about five thousand [men]*"³

The following questions arise out of the Marcan phrases. Why does Mark insert "men (*virī*, not *homines*)" in one narrative and omit it in the other? Why does Mark insert "*about*" in one narrative and omit it in the other? Why does John insert "*in number*" before "about five thousand"? Why does Matthew in both narratives insert "apart from women and

¹ Is. lv. 1 "buy and eat," where Ibn Ezra remarks of "wine" and "milk" that each serves for food as well as for drink.

² John's above-noted application of τρώγειν to Judas in an altered quotation from LXX is perhaps part of a consistent tradition (not mentioned by the Synoptists) concerning the bread dipped in wine and given to Judas alone.

* Mk vi. 44 (R.V.) And they that ate the loaves were five thousand men.	Mt. xiv. 21 (R.V.) And they that did eat were about five thousand men, beside women and children.	Lk. ix. 14 (R.V.) For they were about five thousand men.	Jn vi. 10 (R.V.) So the men sat down, in number about five thou- sand.
--	--	---	--

Mk viii. 9 (R.V.)

And they were about four thousand.

Mt. xv. 38 (R.V.)

And they that did eat were four thousand men, beside women and children.

Note that *ἄνδρες* is inserted except in Mk viii. 9. The Greek phrases are as follows. In the Five Thousand, Mk vi. 44 τετρακισχίλιοι *ἄνδρες*, Mt. xiv. 21 *ἄνδρες ὡσεὶ π.*, χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων, Lk. ix. 14 ὡσεὶ *ἄνδρες π.*, Jn vi. 10 οἱ *ἄνδρες* (or, *ἄνδρες*) τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡς π. In the Four Thousand, Mk viii. 9 ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι, Mt. xv. 38 τετρακισχίλιοι (marg. ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι) *ἄνδρες*, χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων (marg. παιδίων καὶ γυναικῶν).

³ "Men," *ἄνδρες*. *Ἀνὴρ* occurs in Mk elsewhere, only in the sing. vi. 20 "a righteous man," x. 2, 12 "husband."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

children"? And why do Luke and John omit Matthew's clause?

If we look for illustrations from Scripture to answer these questions, we find that the first Hebrew instance of "*about*" with numbers of men occurs in the description of Israel going forth from Egypt¹. The same passage contains almost the first instance of the plural of "man of military age²," as distinguished from women and children: "And the children of Israel departed...*about* six hundred thousand *on-foot* (or, *footmen*)—the men [of military age], apart from children³." This looks back to the first Biblical use of the plural of the word, uttered by Pharaoh, who refuses to let the "*children*" go, but will let the "*men*" (Heb. *geber*) go. In the LXX, these two passages are the first where we find Mark's Greek word for "men" representing the Hebrew *geber*⁴. Later on, the Pentateuch omits both "*about*" and "men of military age" in the passionate exclamation of Moses "Six hundred thousand *footmen* (or, *travellers on foot*) are the people amid whom I am⁵." Jewish tradition notes the apparent discrepancy between this and the preceding mention of the same number; for, during

¹ Exod. xii. 37 Heb. \mathfrak{z} "like," i.e. about. LXX *eis* "amounting to." This is the first instance mentioned in Gesen. 453 a. Strong's Concordance, which is generally very accurate, omits it.

² Heb. \mathfrak{gbl} , *geber*. See Gesen. 149—50.

³ Exod. xii. 37 "apart from children ($\eta\mathfrak{p}$)," LXX $\pi\lambda\eta\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\eta\varsigma$. $\Lambda\pi\omicron\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\eta$, outside LXX, would mean "baggage," the Latin "impedimenta," but in LXX it freq. represents $\eta\mathfrak{p}$, "children." Here Aq. has $\chi\omega\mathfrak{p}\iota\varsigma\ \delta\pi\omicron\delta\ \nu\eta\pi\iota\omicron\upsilon$, Sym. ... $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\chi\lambda\omicron\upsilon$. Comp. Exod. x. 10—11, where Pharaoh says to Moses that he will not let go the "children ($\eta\mathfrak{p}$)" (LXX, Aq. and Sym. as here) but "Go ye, now, the men [of military age]," Aq. $\pi\omicron\mathfrak{p}\omicron\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\ \delta\eta\ \omicron\iota\ \alpha\mathfrak{v}\delta\mathfrak{p}\epsilon\varsigma$, LXX $\pi\omicron\mathfrak{p}\omicron\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\omega\sigma\alpha\mathfrak{n}\ \delta\epsilon\ \omicron\iota\ \alpha\mathfrak{v}\delta\mathfrak{p}\epsilon\varsigma$ (a variation that somewhat resembles the variation in the punctuation of Jn vi. 10). Steph. *Thes.* does not mention this meaning of $\alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\eta$, but see Gen. xxxiv. 29, xliii. 8, etc.

⁴ $\Lambda\mathfrak{v}\eta\rho$ in Pentateuch occurs about 180 times, but not as representing *geber* except in these two passages and Deut. xxii. 5 (forbidding an adult male to put on woman's clothing, and *vice versa*).

⁵ Numb. xi. 21.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the interval, the number is stated elsewhere to have increased. Accordingly Rashi says "Moses was not solicitous" about including additions¹. Many passages in Midrash comment on the numbering of Israel on or before the night of the Exodus as one of ten occasions on which Israel was numbered².

Passing to the Gospels we see that some of their variations correspond to variations in Hebrew Scripture or Jewish tradition. Mark's omission in one narrative, and insertion in another, of "*about*" and "*men [of military age]*," corresponds to the omission of these words in Numbers and the insertion of them in Exodus. Matthew's insertion of "*men*" in both narratives indicates that he regarded "*men*" as emphatic, meaning "*men, not to speak of women and children.*" This followed the precedent of Exodus, where "*apart from children*" was interpreted by R. Ishmael as "*apart from the women and the little ones,*" and by R. Jonathan as "*apart from the women, the children, and the aged*"³.

¹ See Exod. xxxviii. 26, Numb. i. 45—6 "all that were able to go forth to war...603,550" (comp. Numb. ii. 32). Rashi, on Numb. xi. 21, says "Non sollicitus fuit [Moses] ut singulatim numeraret," and tells us of a Rabbi who suggested that the additional 3550 (called by him 3000) were not included because they did not murmur—so that they did not belong to the sixty myriads destined to die in the wilderness.

This view is confirmed by Sir. xvi. 8 "So were 600,000 רגל, edd. *footmen, that were taken away in the arrogancy of their heart.*" Sir. xlvi. 8 "two alone were reserved, out of 600,000 רגל, edd. *men on foot.*" Clem. Rom. § 43 calls them "*the 600,000,*" although at the time mentioned (Numb. xvii. 1 foll.) the number would have been increased, συνεκάλεσεν πάντα τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, τὰς ἑξακοσίας χιλιάδας τῶν ἀνδρῶν.

Sota 12 b gives a quaint interpretation of רגל, "*footmen,*" in the utterance of Moses. It meant "*on my account,*" and implied a presumption for which Moses was punished!

² Ten occasions are mentioned in Numb. v. on Numb. ii. 32, and Pesikta sect. 2, Wü. p. 18 etc. In Numb. v. on Numb. xxvi. 2 it is said that whenever Israel went wrong it needed to be numbered.

³ See Mechill. on Exod. xii. 37.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

It is more difficult to say why John inserts "*in number*," before "about five thousand." It is apparently superfluous. Yet in his subtle, mystical, and allusive Gospel cautious critics will very seldom confidently commit themselves to a statement that they have found superfluities. Can it be that John is affected by Jewish traditions above referred to concerning the "numbering" of Israel as being connected with imperfection or evil?

That, perhaps, is the Johannine view. When Luke in the Acts mentions "number" in passage after passage describing the growth of the Church, he does it with obvious satisfaction¹. But it is doubtful whether John has any such satisfaction in the numbering of the Five Thousand. Regarded mystically, the number "five" is of the flesh, like the "five husbands" of the woman of Samaria; and "the five barley loaves" are typical of rudimentary revelation. Regarded historically (according to John's view), the Five Thousand so completely fail to understand the nature of Christ's sign that they are described as purposing "to snatch him away that they may make him a king²." We can at least say that this explanation is more probable than the hypothesis that John inserted "*in number*"—and this in a narrative so familiar to the Church in various forms and so obviously typical—without attaching to the insertion some meaning, or at all events some allusive significance.

¹ Ἀριθμός occurs in the Acts (iv. 4, etc.), four times out of five, about the growth of the Church. But in the Epistles it occurs only in Rom. ix. 27 "If the *number* of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea it shall be the remnant that shall be saved." This appears to depreciate the value of "numbering." The other N.T. instances of ἀριθμός (except Lk. xxii. 3 "Judas...of the number of the twelve") are all (10) in Revelation. This book also (vii. 9) speaks of "a great multitude which no one could number, standing before the throne." The first mention of "counting" and "numbering" in the Bible is in Gen. xiii. 16 (comp. xvi. 10) and declares that the seed of Abraham *cannot* be numbered.

² Jn vi. 15.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 32. *Irenaeus and Origen on the "five thousand" in the Acts, and Clement of Alexandria on the "five loaves"*

The narratives of the Feeding of the Five Thousand are likely to have been influenced not only by allusions to the events in the history of Israel, and particularly the giving of the manna, but also by prospective allusions to the growth of the Christian Church, more particularly during the period when thousands at a time were converted, according to the Acts, by the preaching of Peter. This influence is not likely to have been so great as that of Eucharistic allusion, but still it is not to be passed by.

Irenaeus says that the convincing effect of prophecy in bringing souls into the Church explains the success of the apostolic preaching, whereby "on one day there were baptized *three thousand men, and four, and five*¹." The Acts mentions the "baptizing" of "three thousand," and subsequently speaks of "five thousand," but nowhere "*four thousand*"; and such language, however it may be explained, shews that early variations might arise about the details of the growth of the Church, some of which might bear on the Gospel narratives of miraculous Feeding². Origen, if his text is not corrupt,

¹ Iren. iv. 23. 2 "et una die baptizati sunt hominum tria millia, et quatuor, et quinque."

² Acts ii. 41 οἱ μὲν οὖν...ἐβαπτίσθησαν, καὶ προσετίθησαν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ψυχαὶ ὥσπερ τρισχίλια, iv. 4 πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν ἀκουσάντων τὸν λόγον ἐπίστευσαν καὶ ἐγενήθη ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὡς χιλιάδες πέντε. Grabe on Irenaeus points to Acts ii. 47 ὁ δὲ κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους καθ' ἡμέραν as a possible explanation. The tradition from which Irenaeus borrowed may have stated that the number of the baptized "*became* on one day 3000, and then 4000, and then 5000." "The [total] number *became*" might easily be confused with "the number [added on this or that occasion] *was*." Comp. Acts iv. 4 ἐγενήθη, A.V. "*was*," R.V. "*came to be*." This may be illustrated by a difference between Lk. ix. 13—14 Curet. "'But let us go ourselves [and] buy food for all this multitude,' *for they were become five thousand men*," and SS "'Except we go and buy ourselves food for all this multitude, *for*

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

appears to combine the Feeding of the Five Thousand by our Lord with the conversion of the Three Thousand in the Acts, and to regard both as fulfilments of the exclamation of Isaiah, "Shall a nation be brought forth at once?" Jerome, commenting fully on the same prophecy, says "It also refers to that time when, on one day, there believed three thousand, and five thousand, of the Jewish people." But Origen's text, as it stands, by inserting a mention of *the Saviour's "Incarnation,"* and also by placing the Five Thousand before the Three Thousand, makes it difficult to suppose that he is referring merely to the Acts. Possibly "three," in Origen's text, is an error for "four." His view certainly was that the miracle of the Four Thousand typified the inclusion of the Gentiles. This "inclusion," if Origen wrote "four thousand," he may have described (in the language of the Acts) as "adding," just as he describes the miracle of the Five Thousand (in the language of the Acts) as "believing":—"When the Saviour

they are five thousand men.'" Possibly Acts iv. 4 ἐγενήθη ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἀνδρῶν is a corruption of some tradition that "there was made a numbering (ἀριθμῶσις) of the men." Something is needed (but Hebrew origination might suffice) to explain the omission of ὁ before ἀριθμὸς (comp. Acts vi. 7 ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν μαθητῶν).

¹ Origen *Jerem. Hom.* ix. 3 (on Is. lxvi. 8) "But 'a nation was brought forth (ἐτίχθη) at once' *when the Saviour (?) had been with us on earth* (ὅτε ἐπιδημήμηκεν ὁ Σωτήρ) and in one day five thousand believed (ἐπίστευσαν) and on another day there were added (προσενέθισαν) three thousand." I do not understand the force of the perfect ἐπιδημήμηκεν contrasted with the aorists. Is it possible that we should read the pluperf. ἐπεδημήμκει, i.e. "when the Saviour *had* [recently] *been incarnate*"? Comp. the earliest instance of ἐπιδημία quoted in Euseb. *H.E.* iv. 3. 2 (from Quadratus) οὐδὲ ἐπιδημῶντος μόνον τοῦ Σωτήρος ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπαλλαγέντος. In that case we must suppose that Origen is quoting from the Acts but reverses the order of the Acts in order to put the larger number first: "There 'believed,' as the Acts says, five thousand men, and on another [and earlier] day there were added [to the Church], as the Acts says, three thousand."

² "Et ad illud tempus referre quando una die tria millia et quinque millia de Judaico populo crediderunt."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

was on earth and there 'believed' (Acts iv. 4) in one day Five Thousand, and in another day there were 'added' (Acts ii. 41) Four Thousand¹."

Other early Christian literature throws little light on distinctions between the Synoptic "five thousand" and "four thousand," or the "five loaves" and the "seven loaves." The plural "loaves" is not used by the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists². The only mention of the "five loaves" by Irenaeus is in an attempt to shew that the number "five" is of frequent occurrence in Scripture and need not have the mystical meaning attributed to it by heretics. In doing this, he asserts that "five" is the number of the pillars that support the veil of the Holy of Holies. But in fact there were "four"³. His error is the less excusable because Philo had taught that the "four" pillars before the Holy of Holies were spiritually superior to the "five" pillars before the screen of the Tabernacle⁴. Clement of Alexandria adopts Philo's interpretation of the "five pillars" as referring to the things of the senses and applies it depreciatively to "the five loaves," which, he says, "are most mystically broken by the Saviour, and supply fulness (?) to the crowd of those hearing Him; for great [indeed is] the [crowd] that gives heed to the things of sense as being alone realities⁵." Clement then mentions "the four pillars" that

¹ That is to say, the *order* of the two miracles is that of the Gospels, but the *language* is that of the Acts, because Origen regards the miracle placed second in the Gospels as being of the nature of an "addition" such as the Acts connects with "three thousand." If Origen wrote thus, it would be very natural for scribes to alter his "four" into "three" (Δ into Γ).

² Goodspeed gives it, however, as a v. r. of Cod. A in Justin Martyr *Apol.* lxvii. 3 ὡς προέφημεν... ἄρτος προσφέρεται, where προέφημεν refers to ch. lxv. and ch. lxvi. mentioning the sing. ἄρτος.

³ Iren. ii. 24. 4.

⁴ Philo on Exod. xxvi. 32—37. Irenaeus (see Grabe's note which should have been added in Clark's translation) has confused the two verses.

⁵ Clem. Alex. 665 ταύτῃ τοῖ μυστικώτατα πέντε ἄρτοι πρὸς τοῦ Σωτῆρος

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

stand at the entrance of the Holy of Holies, as being typical of a more inward and spiritual knowledge. Then he passes to the number "seven," as being that of the planets and of the branches of the sacred lamp, and of "the seven eyes of the Lord" which ("they say") are "the seven spirits resting on the rod that flowers from the root of Jesse¹." Although Clement does not, in this connection, make mention of the "seven loaves" that were broken for the "four thousand," the transition suggests that he had that thought in his mind. If he had, it would be consistent with Origen's view that the miracle of the Four Thousand was higher in the spiritual scale than the earlier miracle of the Five Thousand.

§ 33. "Give ye them to eat," why omitted by John

This omission has not been commented on above because our first business has been to discuss Marcan passages omitted or altered by Luke, and this is not one of them. All the Synoptists have the words "Give ye them to eat," and all of them, especially Luke, emphasize the pronoun "ye²." Origen explains the emphasis, allegorizing the "eating," as if Jesus meant "Ye, my disciples, ye whom I have trained to give the Bread of Life to others, give ye them to eat, and do not think of sending away the hungry multitude unfed³." Origen also, in his own person, declares that Jesus "said *Give ye them to*

κατακλῶνται καὶ πληθύνουσι τῇ ὄχλῳ τῶν ἀκροαμένων, πολὺς γὰρ ὁ τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ὡς μόνοις οὖσι προσανέχων. Πληθύνω is perhaps used as a mild paraphrase of χορτάζω.

¹ Rev. v. 6, Is. xi. 1.

² In Mk vi. 37, Mt. xiv. 16 δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν, the addition of ὑμεῖς to δότε shews that the pronoun in "give ye" is emphasized; but in Lk. ix. 13 (W.H. txt) δότε αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν ὑμεῖς, "ye" is extraordinarily emphatic, coming at the end of the sentence.

³ Origen on Mt. xiv. 16 (Lomm. iii. 68) Ἐπεὶ οὖν παιδεύσας ὑμᾶς ἱκανοὺς ἐποίησα πρὸς τὸ διδόναι τοῖς δεομένοις λογικὴν τροφήν, ὑμεῖς δότε....

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

eat because of that power to feed others besides themselves which He had bestowed on the disciples¹."

It may be taken as certain that John did not believe that the disciples had received at this time the "power to feed others" in the full spiritual sense. Origen adds "So long as these five loaves and two fishes were not *borne* (or, *brought*) by the disciples of Jesus, they did not increase²." But John represents Jesus as Himself distributing the bread to the multitude³, and excludes the disciples from any part in the miracle except the collecting of the broken pieces. The Johannine view of the miracle is quite different from that of the Synoptists. In John, Jesus cannot say to the disciples "Give *ye* them to eat," for they have nothing to give. The loaves do not belong to them. Origen himself points out this, though he quaintly connects it with the inferior nature of the "barley" loaves: "John alone says that the loaves were 'barley loaves.' Wherefore, perhaps, in the Gospel of John, the disciples *do not acknowledge that the loaves are with them*, but say, in John, 'There is a lad here who has five barley loaves and two fishes⁴.'"

It must be admitted that John, by omitting Christ's precept to the Twelve, not only greatly lowers the spiritual character of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, but also departs from what appears to be the earliest and most faithful traditions about it. In the Synoptists, the miracle is a kind of firstfruits of the Eucharist, illustrating the Christian Law of Giving. In the Fourth Gospel, it is a kind of last repetition of the old

¹ Origen (Lomm. iii. 69) δι' ἣν ἔδωκε δύναμιν καὶ ἐτέρων θεραπευτὴν τοῖς μαθηταῖς.

² Origen (Lomm. iii. 70) ὅσον μὲν...οὐκ ἐφίποντο. Is it possible that he is referring to Mt. xiv. 18 φέρτε μοι ἰδε αὐτούς, "bring them hither to me," so that the meaning is "Until they were *brought* by the disciples of Jesus [to their Master]"? Ἐφίποντο does not seem a suitable word to mean "*distributed*" by the disciples to the multitudes.

³ Jn vi. 11, omitted in the Arabic Diatessaron.

⁴ Origen (Lomm. iii. 70).

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

gift of Manna, and the old gift of the Law, exemplifying the failure of both to satisfy and redeem mankind, and demonstrating the need of a new source of spiritual life¹.

§ 34. "Eating" in the presence of the Lord

We have spoken above of the meal provided by Elisha for a hundred of the sons of the prophets; but some mention should also be made of an earlier Scriptural precedent, when Aaron and two of Aaron's sons and seventy of the elders of Israel went up with Moses, "and they saw the God of Israel...and they beheld God *and did eat and drink*." The latter part of this is paraphrased by Onkelos, "They saw the Glory of the Lord, and *rejoiced in their sacrifices, which were accepted with favour, as though they had eaten and drunk*," but by the Jerusalem Targum, "They saw the Glory of the Shekinah of the Lord, and *rejoiced that their oblations were received with favour, and so did eat and drink*²." The passage is frequently referred to in Midrash, where it is mostly implied that Aaron's sons were led into error, perhaps an error of familiarity, in eating and drinking, and were punished for it³. But other passages

¹ If many versions or MSS followed Lk. ix. 13 (codex *a*) "*date eis manducare*" (omitting "*vos*") we might suppose that textual variations induced John to omit a phrase that meant no more than "give them something to eat." But the omission in codex *a* is so exceptional that nothing can be based on it. And the conclusion seems necessary that John's omission was dictated almost entirely by the feeling that the real Eucharistic "giving" was not understood, and indeed was not fully instituted, till after the Resurrection, when Jesus gave the command "Feed my sheep."

² Exod. xxiv. 9—11. The Targums are quoted from Etheridge.

³ See Exod. i. (Wü. pp. 38, 317), Lev. i. (Wü. p. 136), Numb. i. (Wü. p. 411), Pesikt. (Wü. p. 252). Rashi says *ad loc.* "*contemplati erant illum curiose (or, animo elato) etiam inter edendum ac bibendum, sic interpretatio Tanchumae habet; sed Onkelos non ita interpretatus est.*" Comp. Lev. x. 8 (Jer. Targ.) "Drink neither wine nor anything that maketh drunk,...as thy sons did, who have died by the burning of fire."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

connect the "eating and drinking" with a "banquet" on "the glory of the Shechinah," quoting from Proverbs "In the light of the King's countenance is life¹." This "banquet," and the "sitting down" with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the aeon that is to come, are referred to in the tradition of Matthew and Luke². Luke also once connects "table" and "covenant" and "thrones" in such a way as to constitute a parallelism between his words and those of the Pentateuch describing the "eating and drinking" of the "nobles" of Israel³; but the parallel Matthew has nothing that suggests a banquet. Nor has Matthew any mention of eating in his parallel to an earlier passage where Luke has "We ate before thee and drank; and in our streets didst thou teach⁴."

In the passage last quoted from Luke, Cyril paraphrases "*ate*" as the imperfect "*used to eat*," supposing that the words were uttered as an appeal to the Father (not to the Son) and that the words "*ate before thee*" referred to sacrifices eaten in the Temple. But if that had been the meaning, the imperfect

¹ See Taylor's note on *Aboth* iii. 25 "Everything is prepared for the banquet," quoting *Berach.* 17 *a*, and *Numb.* v. xxi., which says that the ministering angels "are fed on the splendour of the Shechinah, for it is said (Prov. xvi. 15) '*In the light etc.*'" On Prov. xvi. 15 see *Pesiht.* Wü. pp. 70, 140, 252, etc.

² Mt. viii. 11, Lk. xiii. 29.

³ Lk. xxii. 29—30. Comp. Exod. xxiv. 11 "nobles," a noticeable word, LXX *ἐπιλέκτων* (one of 13 deviations of LXX discussed in the Talmud, see Levy i. 508 *a*). The parall. Mt. xix. 28 mentions "thrones" and "judging," but has nothing that suggests a banquet.

⁴ Lk. xiii. 26 *ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν*. The parall. Mt. vii. 22 *οὐ τῷ σὺ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν* is blended by Origen repeatedly with Lk. so as to drop the difficult phrase *ἐνώπιόν σου*. Cyril (see Cramer *ad loc.*) explains "*thee*" as "*God*," thus: "How then used they to eat and to drink (*ἔσθιον καὶ ἐπιον*) in the presence of God? By performing the sacrificial-service (*λατρείαν*) of the Law." And he explains "thou didst teach" as referring to the Scriptures, the word of God, heard by the Jews in the synagogues.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

might have been used by Luke here as elsewhere¹. Nevertheless Cyril is right in supposing that "*ate before thee*" is not the same as "*ate with thee*," and that it suggests some act of a disciple of Christ corresponding to the eating of a sacrifice by an Israelite "in the presence of" Jehovah to whom it is offered. But what act, what "eating," could be meant? The least unsatisfactory explanation, perhaps, is that Luke has placed the words in such a position that they may refer to the "eating" of the Five Thousand, which, according to Mark and Luke, was preceded by "teaching" or something corresponding to teaching (so as to fulfil the saying "*thou hast taught* in our streets²"). That would bring the Lucan tradition into harmony with the Johannine view, that the Five Thousand, for the most part, though they "*ate in the presence of*" Jesus, never truly knew Him or believed in Him. He "*taught*" in their "streets," but they did not accept the teaching.

We are not, however, on safe ground in attempting to build positive conclusions as to fact on this Lucan passage³. For there may have been other occasions to which "we ate" might definitely refer, *e.g.* the Feeding of the Four Thousand. That Luke does not mention this miraculous act does not exclude the possibility that he collected traditions referring to it although he did not know the reference. And if there were two such miraculous acts why should there not have been three or more—believed to have occurred before the Resurrection? It does not follow that there were only two because Mark has recorded only two, any more than it follows that there was only

¹ Lk. xvii. 27, 28 ἡσθιον, ἔπινον, followed by ἐγάμων and ἡγόραζον. Ἐσθίω is freq. used for habitual or uncompleted eating.

² Mk vi. 34 διδάσκειν, Lk. ix. 11 ἐλάλει περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ.

³ The fact that Matthew deviates from Luke, and the nature of Matthew's deviation, indicate that we have not here actual words of Christ, but early evangelistic paraphrases of them, indicating how extremists, on either side, whether anti-judaizers or judaizers, would be rejected by Jesus if they rejected His Spirit.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

one because Luke and John have recorded only one—that is to say, only one before the Resurrection. The Acts of John boldly declares that every meal of the disciples with Jesus, even at a Pharisee's table, was¹ miraculous: "Now if ever, having been invited by one of the Pharisees, He went in compliance with such an invitation, we used to go with Him. And one loaf used to be set by the inviter for each [of the guests], among whom He also used to receive one [and no more]. But He, blessing His [own] loaf, would distribute [it] to us. And from the little [thus distributed] each [of us] used to be filled-to-repletion, and our loaves were kept whole and sound, so that amazement fell on those who invited Him¹."

§ 35. "*That he should give something to the poor,*"
in John

John tells us that after the Last Supper, when Jesus said, "That thou doest, do (R.V.) quickly," some supposed that Jesus meant "Buy what things we have need of for the feast, or, that he should give something to the poor¹." Either supposition implies that Judas had been tardy about performing one of two duties that ought seemingly to have been performed before the Supper. We can understand this about the things needed "for the feast"; but how does it apply to the words "that he should give something to the poor"? Was that a duty calling for immediate performance? Only if the duty was connected in the minds of the disciples with the meal at

¹ *Acts of John* § 8. "One loaf (*ἄpros εἰς*)" appears to be meant to be more emphatic than *ἄpros* would have been (without *εἰς*). "One" is emphasized by its position in "among whom He also used to receive *one* [and no more] (*ἐν οἷς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλάβανεν ἓνα*)."
"Filled to repletion," *ἐχοπράξερο* is here used as in the Synoptists, and not in a bad sense (as in Jn vi. 26). Incidentally the mention of "one loaf" is important as shewing the smallness of such "loaves" as we read of in the Bible.

² Jn xiii. 29.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

which they were seated. If their Master had habituated them to the practice of giving something to the poor from their common purse on any special occasion when He sat down to a meal with them, in that case—and only in that case—could they suppose that Jesus sent out Judas, the purse-bearer, with something of the nature of a reproach for neglecting the duty to the poor, "That which thou art bound to do, do more quickly¹."

On another occasion, Luke represents Jesus as saying "Now do ye, the Pharisees, cleanse the outside of the cup... but your inner part is full of ravening.... Only *give ye the things that are inside [the vessel] as alms*, and behold, all things are pure unto you²." Here the meaning might be taken to be, literally, "send out some of the food in the dish to the poor and then all that is in the dish is pure." The parallel Matthew has "*Cleanse first the inward part of the cup*," shewing that this literalism ("send out to the poor") would not represent the meaning³. Yet it may represent a part of the meaning. Luke's version may represent a fact, namely, that Jesus was in the habit of giving to the poor either a portion of the meal at which He presided, or else a gift of money in lieu of that portion where the poor were not present in person. This would be a way of teaching the duty inculcated by Isaiah "Draw out thy soul to the hungry, and satisfy the afflicted soul⁴."

In view of these passages and of what Philo tells us about the common meal of the Therapeutae, we ought not perhaps to put aside the above-quoted grotesque extract from the Acts of John with a mere negation: "Of course there was nothing like this." Of course there was nothing "like this" literally. But

¹ Jn xiii. 27 *τάχιστα* "more quickly." See *Joh. Gr.* 1918 and Index.

² Lk. xi. 39—41, see *Son* 3362 (iv) a, and below, p. 455 foll.

³ Mt. xxiii. 26.

⁴ Is. lviii. 10, on the interpretations of which see *Proclam.* p. 312 "It is not to exclude, but to accompany, material giving."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

are we not in danger of failing to realise that there may have been something "like this" spiritually, even before the Eucharist was instituted? Even at the house of a Pharisee where Jesus was but a guest, the disciples might be made by Him to feel that He was still their King, and that "in the light of the king's countenance there was life¹," and that in His doctrine there was the living bread². Much more would this be the case where Jesus was Himself the host and the breaker of the bread. It seems antecedently probable that Jesus would have put into the breaking of the bread, and into the blessing of God over the bread, something beyond the formal Jewish meaning, something that was of the nature of a sacrifice.

In one of the Psalms, what is called by our Revised Version "*the sacrifice of thanksgiving*," is called by the Authorised Version, more simply and more literally, "*thanksgiving*"; and Aquila, too, renders the precept "Sacrifice unto God *eucharist*³." The next Psalm says "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise⁴." To such a sacrifice Jesus seems to have pointed in His story of the publican who would not so much as lift up his face to heaven but stood afar off saying "God be merciful to me a sinner⁵."

Sorrow for wrong done to one's neighbour goes hand in hand with love and sympathy for one's neighbour; and the awaking consciousness of one's own sins awakens kindness towards others. Jesus is represented by Matthew as twice quoting from Hosea the words "I desire kindness and not

¹ Prov. xvi. 15. See above, p. 358, and Addendum on p. 402.

² See Addendum on p. 402.

³ Ps. l. 14 Aq. *θύσαν* (זבח) *τῷ θεῷ εὐχαριστίαν* (תורה) (LXX *θύσαν τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*). See Gesen. 393 a. "*Acknowledgment*" would be, in many respects, a good rendering of the Hebrew word תורה, since it could include "confession" and (Gesen. 392 b) "*thanksgiving*."

⁴ Ps. li. 17.

⁵ Lk. xviii. 13, peculiar to Luke.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

sacrifice¹," and by Mark as endorsing the saying of a scribe—that to love God and one's neighbour is "better" than sacrifices². Some early Evangelists may have argued: "We, too, we Christians, have a sacrifice. Jesus did not mean that God really desired no sacrifice. The words 'I desire kindness and not sacrifice' are misleading if interpreted apart from the doctrine of Christ as a whole." This may be the reason (or one of the reasons) why Mark and Luke omit the quotation from Hosea, and why Matthew and Luke omit the Marcan tradition. Nevertheless it may be taken as certain that the omitted passages represent Christ's fundamental thought.

§ 36. "*We all partake of the one loaf*"

One more remains to be added to the allusions inherent in early traditions about Christ's Doctrine of Bread, and about the acts accompanying it. It comes to us stamped with Pauline authority, but very difficult (one would suppose) for Greeks to understand without some knowledge of Jewish customs⁴. Speaking to his Corinthian converts about the Christian Eucharist Paul says "*We all partake of the one loaf.*"

This assumes that "the one loaf" was the emblem of unity and that the Corinthians understood the assumption. There is nothing in Greek literature that points to, or explains, any such notion. But we learn from Maimonides and from a Talmudic tract called *Erubin*, that is, *Communion*s or *Mixings*, that the Jews had such a notion and a practice based upon it. The scribes carried it back to Solomon, and the language used by Paul indicates that it was at all events an established practice of the Synagogue in Corinth during the first century.

¹ Mt. ix. 13, xii. 7 quoting Hos. vi. 6.

² Mk xii. 33.

³ 1 Cor. x. 17.

⁴ Acts xviii. 7—17 shews the important part played by the Corinthian Synagogue in connection with the foundation of the Corinthian Church.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Maimonides tells us, in effect, that it is forbidden to neighbours to go [on the sabbath day] from one house to another "unless all the neighbours on the sabbath eve enter into communion (*lit.* make an *Erub* or Mixing)... But how is that communion made? They communicate in one food, which they prepare on the eve of the sabbath, as though they would say, We all communicate, and we have all one food¹." Then he adds that this communion must be made with a whole loaf. Portions, however large they may be, of large loaves, cannot replace the one small loaf however small it may be: "They do not consort together in courts save with a whole loaf²."

The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles contains a brief Eucharistic ritual in which what Paul calls "*the loaf that we break*" is briefly called "*the broken [thing]*," or "*this which we are breaking*³." This is said to be a unique use of the word *clasma*, which in the Gospels and elsewhere means "fragment." Certainly it does not mean "fragment" here. For the ritual continues "As this *clasma* existed [once as seed] scattered abroad (*or*, widely sown) on the hills, and having been gathered together, became one, so let thy Church be gathered together

¹ See *Hor. Heb.* on 1 Cor. x. 17.

² The quotation continues "Although the bread of the batch be a whole *seah*, if it be not a whole loaf, they do not enter into consortship with it. But if it be whole, if it be no more than an *assarius* only, they enter into consortship with it."

"How do they enter into *κοινωνίαν*, communion, in the courts? They demand of every house which is in the court one whole cake or loaf, which they lay up in one vessel, and in some house which is in the court, although it be a barn, or a stable etc. And one of the company blesseth, and so all eat together," etc.

The phrase for "a whole loaf" is *פת שלימה בלכד* "a loaf complete by itself." Apparently the blessing and breaking would take place over one of these "whole loaves," one representing the whole number.

³ *Didach.* ix. 3 *περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος· Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι... follows πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου· Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι*, implying that "the broken" was a Eucharistic term as familiar to the readers as "the cup."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom¹." This passage, and the Jewish practice of "communion by means of the one loaf," indicate that the word "bread (*or loaf*)," conveyed to Jews suggestions of unity that would be unintelligible to Greeks without explanation.

In the first passage where "bread" is mentioned in the Bible the LXX represents God as saying to Adam "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread²." But the Hebrew omits "thy," and the Targum takes the meaning to be, in effect, "Thou shalt be permitted to eat bread, the food of man, instead of eating the herb of the field, the food of beasts—which was at first the sentence pronounced on thee." The Jews appear to have discerned in a loaf—prepared by the hand of man out of many particles through many processes, sowing, reaping, threshing, grinding, kneading and baking—a unity not apparent in a heap of grass or herbs. This unity seemed a fit symbol of the unifying power that converts individuals into a community, congregation, or church. When and whence this notion came into their literature is perhaps not ascertainable, but that it was current among the Christians of the first century is certain. We ought therefore to be prepared to find a trace of it in the Fourth Gospel.

§ 37. "*Jesus...taketh the loaf and giveth to them*³," in John

The Fourth Gospel concludes with a description of Jesus giving a meal in the morning to seven of His disciples who

¹ *Didach.* ix. 4 ὡς περ ἦν τοῦτο τὸ κλάσμα διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὁρίων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἓν, οὕτω συναχθήτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν. The position of ἦν shews that it is best taken by itself and not as part of a pluperf. "had been scattered." See p. 340, n. 2, for Jerome's saying "seminarium fit ciborum," and see *Son* 3806 a for the metaphor of "sowing" Israel.

² Gen. iii. 19.

³ Jn xxi. 13 ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς. On Jn xxi. 9 A.V. "fish...bread," Westcott says "Rather, a fish... a loaf.... Compare *ib.* 13 *the fish... the loaf*. The thought of unity

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

have been fishing. The food is first spoken of thus, as being seen by the fishermen disciples who have been fishing: "So when they got out upon the land they see a fire of coals laid and a fish laid thereon and a loaf¹." No mention is made of the source whence the food came. Nor are the fishermen at once invited to partake of it. First they are bidden to draw in the net. They had caught nothing all through the night. But at the dawn, having been instructed to cast the net "on the right side," they have at last caught a draught, and the "at last" is emphasized in the command "Bring of the fish that ye have *now* taken." When this duty is performed they are invited to the morning meal, and then it is said that Jesus "cometh and taketh the loaf and giveth to them and the fish likewise."

Why and whence is Jesus described as "coming"? Is He to be regarded as now coming from a distance although at the beginning of the story He "stood on the beach" and the disciples have now "got out upon the land"? This seems impossible. "Coming" seems superfluous, if taken literally. But it may be taken as the act of "Him that Cometh²," like the Light that "cometh into the world," coming to all the seven collectively and to each individually. Then it becomes intelligible.

Similarly as regards the "taking," we are not to regard the word literally as signifying that He went to the fire and

seems to be distinctly presented." In Jn vi. 11, W. H. read *δίδωκεν* (Tisch. *ἔδωκεν*) but here *δίδωσιν* (*D εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν*). In Jn xxi. 13, SS has "and Jesus took [the] bread and [the] fish and blessed [God] over them and gave to them."

¹ Jn xxi. 9 *βλέπουσιν ἀνθρακῶν κειμένην καὶ ὀψάριον ἐπικείμενον*. R.V. omits *κειμένην*, or paraphrases it by "there." But in view of John's use of *κείμεναι* elsewhere and the contextual *ἐπικείμενον* here, it seems desirable to render the two participles "*laid*" and "*laid thereon*." See below, p. 368 foll.

² On "Him that Cometh" as a name of the Messiah, see *Joh. Voc.* 1633, *Son* 3239—41.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

took off the loaf¹, either once for all the disciples, or seven times for each of them. He "takes" it as the father of any Jewish family might "take" bread in his hands before blessing God and breaking it. In the Feeding of the Five Thousand Jesus is described as "giving separately" or "distributing." Here He simply "gives." What He "gives," whether a part of the loaf or the whole, is not made clear. It would have been easy to make it clear. But the writer leaves it in doubt—with what looks like deliberate purpose—as if to lead us to say "After all, what does it matter? Jesus comes. This must mean He comes to each. He gives. This must mean He gives to each. And what else can He give to us as our bread except Himself? We had a foretaste of this truth in the sign of the barley loaves; and the truth itself is now set forth in this homely farewell breakfast given by the Lord to prepare the disciples to labour for Him after His departure."

If words that at first appear superfluous in this narrative are to be regarded as symbolical or allusive, what symbolical meaning are we to attach to the "*fire of coals laid*"? Why is the word "*laid*" inserted—a word so superfluous (seemingly) that it is left untranslated by our English Versions? And what allusion, if any, exists in the rare word "*fire-of-coals*"? The Greek for "*fire of coals*" occurs nowhere else in N.T. except in the Johannine account of Peter's denials. There it is said that the servants of the High Priest had "*made*" the "*fire of coals*," but here no "*maker*" or "*layer*" is mentioned. A supernatural origin is however suggested, like that of the "*coals*" by the side of Elijah whom "*an angel touched*," and "*he looked, and behold, there was at his head a cake *baken on the coals**"². The Hebrew there rendered "*coals*" occurs nowhere else except in Isaiah "*Then flew one of the seraphim*

¹ Apparently the loaf is on the embers. So Nonnus takes it, calling the loaf *νέον*, "*new*," and the fire *μαρτυρομένην*, i.e. dying down.

² 1 K. xix. 6 "*coals*," marg. "*hot stones*."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

unto me having a *live coal* in his hand," where the touch of the coal purifies the prophet's lips and prepares him to deliver his message¹. An ancient Christian commentary calls attention to the coincidence that Peter "denied and confessed near a coal fire²." Are we to suppose that it is more than a coincidence, and that the coal fire represents trial or temptation of two kinds:—first, in the High Priest's palace, temptation, for evil, proceeding from men, secondly, by the Sea of Tiberias, temptation, for good³, proceeding from God?

There is more to be said for such a view than at first sight appears. For if such a representation were intended we could the better understand that this fire is regarded as "laid," "set," or "appointed." The Greek word is the same as that used in the sayings "The axe is *laid* to the root of the trees⁴," and "This [child] is (lit.) *laid* (R.V. *set*) for the falling and rising up of many in Israel⁵." It is also used by John in connection with the sign of the wine at Cana: "Now there were there stone water-vessels, six [in number], in accordance with the purifying of the Jews, *laid* [*ready*]," that is, *prepared for use, or for Christ's sign*⁶. And the same apparent superfluity and latent mysticism is to be found in the account of the vinegar at the Cross: "After this, Jesus,...that the scripture might be accomplished, saith, I thirst. *A vessel lay* [*ready for*

¹ Is. vi. 6 "*live coal*," marg. "*hot stone*."

² See *Son* 3369 a foll.

³ Yet where is the "temptation for good"? May we see it in the question "Lovest thou me *more than these*?" as if it meant "Wilt thou still *set thyself up above the others*, and say, *Though all should stumble yet not I*?" In his reply, Peter does not now give prominence to "I" but to "Thou." That is to say, he makes no profession directly about himself, but appeals to Christ's knowledge ("thou knowest that I love thee").

⁴ Mt. iii. 10, Lk. iii. 9.

⁵ Lk. ii. 34.

⁶ Jn ii. 6 ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ λίθιναι ὑδρίαὶ ἑξὶ κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων κείμεναι. The *Philocalia* of Origen § 12 (Lomm. xxv. 14) paraphrases this as αἱ ἐπὶ καθαρισμῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὑδρίαὶ κεῖσθαι λεγόμεναι, but that is only a paraphrase.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the soldiers, or for the fulfilment of scripture] full of vinegar¹." Similarly here the meaning may be that the "coal fire" was "laid" by the hand of God, the sign of that fiery trial through which the soul is to pass into communion with Him. This is a new revelation not given to the Five Thousand. They took the bread of the barley loaves and were filled with it as cattle with fodder. But this bread, or rather this one loaf, comes "*laid above*" fire; and the fire itself is no ordinary one, but fire as from the altar in heaven, "*laid*" by the hand of God.

It should be noted that after Peter and the rest have partaken of this food baked on the coal fire, Peter is warned that he himself will "follow" Jesus on the way of the Cross, dying by crucifixion. If that is to be his fiery trial, the question arises whether in early Christian literature there are any traces of a comparison between martyrdom and the baking of bread baked on the coals. There is something of the kind in the account of the martyrdom of Polycarp. He was burned alive, and the martyr's body is said to have emitted a fragrant odour like that of "*bread that is being baked*".² Eusebius omits this; but there can hardly be a doubt that he omits it, not as a corrupt reading but in fear that the detail might shock his readers. The fear was (doubtless) well grounded in the days of Constantine. But when the Church was not yet established, and while it was still being watered with the blood of martyrs, passionate metaphor was natural and necessary. Clement of Alexandria not only uses language resembling that rejected by Eusebius, but also applies it to Christ Himself. Commenting on the words of Jesus "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world," Clement implies that the "*flesh*" must be prepared by "*fire*" to become the food of the world. Then, playing on the double meaning of

¹ Jn xix. 29 σκεῦος ἔκειτο ὄξους μεστόν. Nonnus "there was ready (τροίμον ἔην)."

² Polyc. Mart. § 15 ὡς ἄπρος ὀπτόμενος (v.l. ὀπτόμενος) is omitted (Lightf.) by Eusebius.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the Greek *pyros*, i.e. "fire" or "wheat," he introduces the thought of the wheat rising up in a kind of resurrection, and likens it at the same time to "*bread that is being baked*¹." Aesthetically such language may be repellent, but it will be of use if it leads us to think how very much is implied by the author of the Fourth Gospel, for himself and for those who are in sympathy with him, by the vision of "the fire of coals" and that which was "laid thereon."

§ 38. Christ's "leaven"

This loaf that is seen, along with the fish, on "the coal fire²," is it to be supposed to be leavened or unleavened? The same question applies to the "one loaf" that the disciples had with them when they were told to "beware of leaven³." Tertullian implies a connection of "leaven" with fire through the "oven" in which bread is baked⁴. He is referring to Christ's saying that the Kingdom of God "is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till it was all leavened⁵"; but he does not explain to us the nature of this "leaven," or its relation to "the leaven of the Pharisees." Ignatius recognises a "*new leaven*" as appertaining to Christ⁶.

¹ Clem. Alex. 125 ἐνταῦθα τὸ μυστικὸν τοῦ ἄρτου παρασημειώτων, ὅτι σάρκα αὐτὸν λέγει καὶ ὡς ἀνισταμένην δῆθεν διὰ πυρὸς, καθάπερ ἐκ φθορᾶς καὶ σπορᾶς ὁ πυρὸς ἀνίσταται, καὶ μέντοι διὰ πυρὸς συνισταμένην εἰς εὐφροσύνην ἐκκλησίας ὡς ἄρτον πεπτόμενον.

² Jn xxi. 9.

³ Mk viii. 15.

⁴ Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* (on Lk. xiii. 21) "fermentationem quoque congruere...regno Creatoris quia post illam clibanus vel furnus gehennae sequatur." See context. Is he referring to Hosea vii. 4?

⁵ Mt. xiii. 33 ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ζύμη ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυψεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία ἕως οὗ ἐξυμώθη ὅλον, sim. Lk. xiii. 21.

⁶ Ign. *Magn.* § 10 ὑπέρθεσθε οὖν τὴν κακὴν ζύμην τὴν παλαιωθεῖσαν καὶ ἐνοξίσασαν, καὶ μεταβάλεσθε εἰς νέαν ζύμην, ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. On this, Lightf. quotes 1 Cor. v. 7 "purge out the old leaven," but gives no instance of "*new leaven*." He adds "On the metaphor generally see the note *Galatians* v. 9." In that note, he says "The

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Justin Martyr recognises a "*new leaven*" as the opposite of the "*old*" Egyptian "*leaven*," which was to be superseded by the "*new*," after the brief interval of the week of unleavened bread¹. It is possible that this aspect of Christ's doctrine—implying an antithesis between "*old leaven*" and "*new leaven*," between "*bad leaven*" and "*good leaven*"—was overshadowed by the Pauline antithesis between "*leaven*" and "*the unleavened*." At all events it is a significant fact that in the writings of the early Christian Fathers and Apologists the words "*leaven*" and "*unleavened*" do not occur except in

leaven of Scripture is always a symbol of evil, with the single exception of the parable (Matt. xiii. 33, Luke xiii. 20, 21), as it is for the most part also in rabbinical writers: see Lightfoot on Matt. xvi. 6 and Schöttgen on 1 Cor. v. 6."

But "for the most part" would be misleading if it led the reader to suppose that either Lightfoot (i.e. the author of *Horae Hebraicae*) or Schöttgen quotes, from "rabbinical writers," a single instance of "*leaven*" in a good sense. Nor does Wetstein quote one. Nor is any alleged in the Biblical Dictionaries of Black and Hastings ("*Leaven*"). Dr A. Büchler informs me that he has been unable to find any such instance.

¹ Justin (*Tryph.* § 14) is bold enough to say to the Jews "Wherefore also, after the seven days of eating unleavened bread, God commanded you to knead for yourselves *new leaven*, that is to say, the doing of other works and not the imitation of those that were old and vile." He has previously said (*ib.*) "For this is the symbol of the unleavened, [being intended] in order that ye may not do the old deeds of the evil leaven."

² 1 Cor. v. 6 foll. "Know ye not that a little *leaven* leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out the *old leaven*, that ye may be a new lump, even as ye are *unleavened*. For our passover also hath been sacrificed, [even] Christ; wherefore let us keep the feast, not with *old leaven*, neither with the *leaven of malice and wickedness*, but with the *unleavened bread of sincerity and truth*."

If Paul had been asked "But what are we to do during the rest of the Christian Year, after keeping the Christian Passover? Are we never to partake of the bread described by our Lord as 'wholly leavened'?" he would doubtless have replied "Yes." But he deals with a different aspect of the metaphor, as if Christians were always keeping their Passover.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the two passages quoted above from Ignatius and Justin Martyr, and in one other instance where Justin says to the Jews "If ye eat *unleavened* bread ye say that ye have fulfilled the will of God¹." Perhaps one reason why the doctrine of Christ's leaven fell into the background was that among Gentiles, as well as among Jews, there was a feeling that leaven was corrupt and impure². Another reason may have been that Christ's doctrine was obscured by superabundant allegorism³.

¹ Justin Martyr *Tryph.* § 12.

² See Lightf. on Gal. v. 9, "Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.* 109 (p. 289 E), in answer to the question why the Flamen Dialis was not allowed to touch leaven, explains it, ἡ ζύμη καὶ γίγνεν ἐκ φθορᾶς αὐτῇ καὶ φθείρει τὸ φύραμα μὲννυμένη." Comp. Tertull. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 30 "post illam [i.e. fermentationem] clibanus vel furnus gehennae."

³ Jerome, on Mt. xiii. 33, gives three explanations of it, and says that he has not space for others. Many of them might deal with the allegorical meaning of the "three measures of meal," on which see Clem. Alex. 694. The N.T. ἐνέκρυψεν εἰς ἀλεύρον πάντα τρία might invite comparison with Gen. xviii. 6 (Aq. Sym.) τρία πάντα σεμιδάλεως (al. exempl. τρία μέτρα ἀλεύρον σεμιδάλεως) καὶ ποιήσων ἐγκρυφίας, on which Philo has much to say. Clem. Alex. 693—4 (following Philo) connects Gen. xviii. 6 ἐγκρυφίας, "cakes hidden [in the embers]" with a mystical "hiding," and subsequently quotes Mt. xiii. 33 ἐνέκρυψεν, referring to the threefold nature of man.

The doctrine of "good leaven" and "bad leaven" seems to imply the pre-existence of a food that can be assimilated to good or evil. Elsewhere Jesus speaks of a "good eye" and an "evil eye," and of an antagonism, or want of harmony, between "the flesh" and "the spirit," and implies (Mk xiv. 38, Mt. xxvi. 41, but not Lk.) that man can control the evil or the weakness. Some of these expressions may be illustrated by a very ancient Jewish doctrine about a "good" and a "bad" nature in man. See *Aboth* iv. 2 "Who is mighty? He that subdues his nature (יצור)" (Taylor's note). The Heb. *yetser* (Gesen. 428) meant "form, framing, purpose," occurring for the first time in Gen. vi. 5 "every imagination of the thoughts of his [man's] heart was only evil." It means, in New Heb., "impulse" or "tendency" (Gesen. "good or bad tendency in man"). Levy gives abundant instances of the New Heb. use, and (ii. 258) of the fem. יצירה meaning the earthly and the heavenly shaping ("Bildung") of man. *Inter alia* it quotes *j. Jeb.* iv. 5^a "zwei Bildungen

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

And yet is it not in accordance with the simple homeliness and restfulness of Christ's doctrines that He should have raised a protest for leaven as an emblem of quiet and unobtrusive growth, and for leavened bread as a homely and pleasant gift of God? Luke places the parables of leaven and mustard seed after the sabbath cure of the "daughter of Abraham." The ruler of the synagogue reproved the act. Jesus said to him and his abettors, "Ye hypocrites¹!" He implies that they were defiled with "the leaven of the Pharisees,"—a hypocritical zeal, a sin against the light, in placing the literal prohibitions of the Law of Leviticus above the dictates of natural humanity. God, in Nature, works not so much by repressing as by developing. And this Jesus proceeded to shew by the parables of the mustard seed, and of the leaven fermenting in the loaf. The leaven was kindness, divine kindness, passing from the Father in heaven to His children and from His children to one another.

An instance of what Paul might have called "*the leaven of the Pharisees*" may be found in the record of the proceedings

des Menschen, nämł. zuerst innerhalb dreier Tage nach Empfang des Samens, und dann nach 40wöchiger Schwangerschaft."

Ign. Magn. § 10, after the words "*new leaven* which is Jesus Christ," continues, "*Be salted* (ἀλιθῆτε) in Him, lest any one among you grow putrid (διαφθαρή) since from your savour ye will be detected (ἀνιχνεύσασθε)"—which alludes to Mk ix. 49—50 (comp. Mt. v. 13, Lk. xiv. 34) "for everyone shall be salted with fire." On the other hand Justin Martyr (*Tryph.* § 14) before mentioning "*new leaven*," discourses on "*baptism*," and "*the water of life*"—not the "living water" that satisfies spiritual thirst, but the "water of life" regarded as washing away spiritual defilement. Both writers illustrate the variety of metaphor with which early Christians, following the earliest traditions of their Master's words, inculcated the doctrine of spiritual regeneration, and they lead to the conclusion that this doctrine was very much more in His thoughts than we might have inferred from the Synoptic Gospels, and from the absence of any continuous discourse about it in the Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke (commonly called "Q").

¹ Lk. xiii. 15.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

of the Council of Jerusalem. After the admission of uncircumcised Gentiles to the Church by Peter, in accordance with a revelation from the Lord, "There arose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed, saying, It is needful to circumcise them, and to charge them to keep the law of Moses¹." Paul did not speak on this occasion. But, had he spoken, it would probably have been to this effect: "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love.... This persuasion [cometh] not from him that calleth you. *A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*²." This "little leaven" is leaven in a bad sense. Why cannot we point to mentions of "*a little leaven*" in a good sense? Perhaps because this metaphor was too cosmopolitan for many Jews and too homely and original for many Gentiles. But these very reasons are reasons for believing that it originated from Jesus Himself—more alive than His disciples to the quiet and unobtrusive influences of beneficent Nature.

These considerations indicate that the whole of the Mark-Matthew comparison between the Feeding of the Five Thousand and that of the Four Thousand may have been omitted by Luke, not because he disbelieved that there had been such a comparison, but because he believed that it referred to a period after Christ's resurrection. The disciples may have received at that time some revelation about the admission of the Gentile element into the Church, such a revelation as Peter received at Joppa. A voice may have come to them from Jesus, warning them against the "leaven" of "the Pharisees," the leaven of exclusiveness and unkindness, and reminding them that all alike, Jews and Gentiles, must feed on a bread that was not unleavened but was leavened with the "new leaven" of "faith working through love." The circumstances of the two acts of feeding were different, but the

¹ Acts xv. 5.

² Gal. v. 6—9.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

principle was the same. As the Apostles, when ministering to the twelve tribes of Israel, received correspondently twelve *cophinoi* of fragments, so, when ministering to the multitude of the Gentiles, who came from the four quarters of the world, they received seven *sphurides*, a number that would correspond to "the seven Spirits of God" and "the seven Churches," mentioned in Revelation. The "five loaves" of the Law were broken for the former; the "seven" loaves of the Spirit for the latter. But the loaves were broken by one and the same Lord. The difference did not prevent the recognition of the fact that all alike, Jews and Gentiles, partook of the "one loaf."

§ 39. *The passionateness of the Eucharist*

In the foregoing investigation the main object has been to ascertain, not what was the fact, but what was believed to be the fact by the Evangelists, and especially in those narratives where Luke omitted or altered something that was in Mark. And we have been led to the conclusion that Mark contains traces—not found in Luke and rarely found in Matthew—of early Eucharistic doctrine taught by Christ before the institution of the Eucharist. John appears to have cleared away what obscured those traces so that they shew something like a path, which he has broadened and lengthened into a highway running right through his Gospel. But this path or highway may guide us to the actual and historical fact.

Among the Jews it was customary for the father of the family, at the commencement of a family meal, to take up a loaf and to bless God over it and break it. This practice Jesus appears to have adopted, breathing into it a new spiritual meaning and a passionateness of His own. It was not enough, He might say, to lift up and break the loaf. We must, as Jeremiah said, "lift up our heart with our hands unto God in the heavens¹," and the best way to lift up the heart to God

¹ Lam. iii. 41.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

the Father in the breaking of bread was to do something from one's heart for His children that had no bread. This something was not to be the mere giving of alms for the sake of reward. Such alms (Jesus declared) the Pharisaean formalists gave. They allowed a conventional religion of rules to drive out the natural morality of the conscience. They encouraged a son to withhold a *Corban* from his needy parents in order to give it to God. But Christ's religion was to be of the heart, and His almsgiving was to be a "drawing out" of the "soul" to the hungry¹, a suffering with their sufferings, an action that partook of the nature of sacrifice.

It is not definitely recorded that Jesus ever carried out these precepts in a literal way by summoning the poor to His table and giving them food, or by sending them food or money before sitting down to table². Jesus had no house, no "table," that He could call His own. But all the Evangelists agree that on one occasion, out in "the wilderness," He (so to speak) extemporised a "table" for a hungry multitude. Mark and Matthew add that He did this on a second occasion. John relates that He did this, after the Resurrection, on a third occasion. In the apocryphal Acts of John it is said that He did this habitually for His disciples even when He and they were in the house of a stranger.

There is a striking difference between Mark and Luke in one of these traditions about Jesus and His disciples at their common meal. Whereas Luke represents Jesus as saying to His disciples "Who is greater, he that sitteth at meat or he that serveth [at table]? . . . But I am in the midst of you as he that serveth [at table]," Mark represents Him as saying "The Son of man came not to be served [at table] but to serve [at table], and to give his life (*or*, soul) a ransom for many."

¹ Is. lviii. 10.

² See, however, p. 360 foll., on Jn xiii. 29 "that he should give something to the poor."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Also the occasions differ. Luke places the words much later than Mark, as being actually uttered at table, during the Last Supper¹.

John deals with these traditions in a simple, concrete, and dramatic way. Perhaps he knew that Mark's noun "servant [at table]," *diaconos*, or "deacon"—omitted by Luke—was liable to be confused with the Christian official "deacon²." At all events he first uses the noun concerning the "*servants [at table]*" in Cana who draw the water that becomes wine³. Then he uses the verb concerning Martha's literal, homely, waiting at table "*Martha was serving [at table]*"⁴. Then, in the Temple on the morrow, when Jesus has heard that "certain Greeks" desire to see Him, there is a noteworthy change in the use of the word. The Law of the spiritual Harvest, and of Life through Death, is proclaimed as if it were also the Law of the Feast, or Joy, or Table, in Heaven, at which Table no soul is admitted to feast until it has first "*waited*," or "*served*," and he that desires thus to "*serve*" must be willing to lose his life: "He that loveth his life loseth (*or*, destroyeth) it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal. If any one is *bent on serving me [at my table]* let him follow me, and where I am there also shall be *my servant [that serves at my table]*. If any one is *bent on serving me [at my table]*, him will my Father honour⁵."

This is the last Johannine instance of the word "serve [at table]" either as noun or as verb, but John proceeds to dramatize the *thing* by representing Jesus as actually "serving [at table]," during the Last Supper, girding Himself with a towel and washing the feet of the disciples. This no other Evangelist has related. In previous parts of this series the

¹ Mk x. 45, Lk. xxii. 27.

² *Proclam.* p. 404.

³ Jn ii. 5, 9.

⁴ Jn xii. 2. Comp. Lk. x. 40 "Martha was distracted (*περὶ πολλὰ*) about much *serving [at table]* (*διακονίαν*)."

⁵ Jn xii. 25—6. See *Joh. Gr.* 2552 c.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

question has been discussed whether John's narrative of this particular act of "serving at table" can be accepted as literally true in spite of its omission by the Synoptists, and the opinion was expressed that the event was probably historical even if it did not occur on that particular occasion¹. This opinion has been confirmed by further study revealing, through many sources, but especially through Mark and John, traces of early passionate feeling, expressed in passionate words, concerning the Sacrifice of the Eucharist and details connected with it. Some of these expressions might be omitted or softened in later days.

§ 40. *The "kiss of love"*

It is of the utmost importance that we, Christians, should recall as far as possible this Christian passionateness, so far as it came from Christ Himself. The details of the Miracles of Feeding—the "taking" and "blessing" and "breaking," and the question whether the "breaking" may be metaphorical as well as literal, meaning the dividing and distribution of the word of God—are all subordinate to the realisation of the spirit of the common meal which we call the Eucharist, and to the question of the origin of that spirit. Hence, in conclusion, a few words of apparent digression from the Miracles of Feeding in the Gospels to the thought of the Eucharist as it is discerned in the Epistles, may really be no digression at all, but a return to the essence of our subject. Now among the accompaniments of the Eucharist (or of Christian gatherings) most frequently mentioned in the Epistles is the "kiss." Paul speaks of "a holy kiss," Peter of "a kiss of love" wherewith Christians are to salute one another². Whence did this spring?

¹ See *Son* 3276 a (and Index, "Washing") and the references there given.

² Rom. xvi. 16, 1 Cor. xvi. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 12, 1 Thess. v. 26, *ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίῳ* (and comp. 1 Pet. v. 14 *ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης*). The meaning might be "with the holy kiss," or "the kiss of love." The long article on "Kiss" in Smith's *Dict. Antiq.* ii. 902—6 contains

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

We find nothing alleged from Jewish or Gentile practice that explains it¹. It is true that Jesus is represented as saying reproachfully to a Pharisee at whose table He is sitting as a guest "Thou gavest me no kiss²"; but no commentator (so far as I know) shews that the kiss was a mere courtesy among the Jews—a courtesy expected by guests from their host as a matter of course. Has Luke been misled by the special practice of Christians? Did Jesus introduce it among His disciples as a sign that they belonged to the Family of God?

It was a practice open to obvious abuse. Only the earlier Pauline Epistles and the first Epistle of Peter contain the precept to salute after this fashion. Clement of Alexandria complains of the abuse of it between the sexes³. Athenagoras is said to quote an apocryphal precept of caution about it⁴.

no mention or suggestion of any Jewish or Gentile origin or precedent for the Christian rite.

¹ On Rom. xvi. 16 (on which Wetstein and Schöttgen give no help) Fritzsche has a long note, and Lightfoot has one on 1 Thess. v. 26. But they give no illustration from Jewish usage. Nor is there any light thrown by Hamburger i. 685, or Levy iii. 453—4 where different kinds of kisses are distinguished.

² Lk. vii. 45. On this *Hor. Heb.* is silent, as also on 1 Cor. xvi. 20 "a holy kiss."

³ Clem. Alex. 301 "The shameless use of the kiss, which ought to be mystic, occasions foul suspicions and evil reports."

⁴ Athenagoras *Legat.* § 32. This is important because if (as the translator in Clark's translation suggests) Athenagoras is quoting "probably from some apocryphal writing," the testimony takes us back to a period even earlier, and perhaps much earlier, than A.D. 177: "For the Logos again says to us 'If anyone kiss a second time because it has given him pleasure, [he sins],' adding, 'Therefore the kiss, or rather the salutation, should be given with the greatest care (οὕτως οὖν ἀκριβέσασθαι τὸ φίλημα μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ προσκύνημα διί)....'" Here the correction of "kiss" into προσκύνημα, implying an act of homage or "worship" (in the old English sense), and the precept to "be precise about it (ἀκριβέσασθαι)," prove that the author of this early saying is referring to what Paul and Peter call "the holy kiss" or "kiss of love." He seems to regard it as almost equivalent to an act of homage or love to Christ, as the Lord and the Beloved,

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Athenagoras is defending the Christians against the charge of practising promiscuous intercourse, and he declares that, so far from doing this, they recognise fellow-believers as being spiritually blood relations according to age, sons or daughters, brothers or sisters, fathers or mothers; and he bids us recognise "the kiss or rather the obeisance" as the symbol of family affection. Similarly the Jews, excusing the "kiss" given by Jacob to Rachel, added to the three lawful kinds of kissing a fourth, namely, the kiss between blood relations¹. Now the Synoptic Gospels tell us that Jesus introduced as it were a relationship of blood between all His disciples, including them in His own relations when He said "Who is my mother and my brethren? And looking round on them that sat round about him, he saith, Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother²."

The parallel Luke—which has been discussed elsewhere³—omits this last phrase where "sister" is added to "brother." John has nothing of the kind verbally. But if, by "brother" and "sister," we mean "beloved as a brother" and "beloved as a sister," then we may say that by implication John did not shrink from including sisters as well as brothers in the newly instituted Family of Christ. He does this as usual in a dramatic and concrete form. The sisters of Lazarus, he says, "sent to Jesus, saying, Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is

paid invisibly to Him when paid visibly to the brethren and sisters who are members of His Body.

¹ See Gen. xxix. 11 and Gen. 1. *ad loc.*, also Exod. 1. on Exod. iv. 27, and Lev. iii. 453 b. The other three lawful kinds were (1) "the kiss of magnifying (גדולה) or glorifying," given by Samuel to Saul (1 S. x. 1), (2) "the kiss of meeting [after long absence]" (Exod. iv. 27), (3) "the kiss of separation" (Ruth i. 14).

² Mk iii. 33—5, Mt. xii. 48—50, comp. Lk. viii. 21.

³ The exact details of the parallelism are somewhat complicated. See *Proclamation* p. 470 foll.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

sick¹." Then he adds, "Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus"; and he represents the tears of Martha's sister as preceding, and in part causing, tears from Jesus, and thus as preceding (and perhaps preparing for) the raising of Lazarus².

Lucian is the only writer of literary Greek quoted in the Thesaurus as using the expression "salute with a kiss," and the context shews how bad an impression the connection of such a phrase with Christian worship might produce on Gentiles³. Philo would certainly not have approved of it, for he expatiates on the frequent falseness of this "superficial welcoming," and is at great pains to distinguish the Greek, *philēma*, "kiss," literally "act of love," from *philiā*, "love" (or "friendship")⁴. Thus no Greek source presents itself for this Christian custom. And we have seen above that no Jewish source presents itself either, except in special conditions. We are driven to the conclusion that in some way one or more of those "special conditions" was fulfilled. Now one of these "special conditions" was blood-relationship. That, as we have seen, Christ might be said to have introduced among

¹ Jn xi. 3.

² Jn xi. 5, 33 foll.

³ See Lucian ii. 248 *Alex.* § 41 φιλήματι ἀσπάσασθαι, and οἱ ἐντὸς τοῦ φιλήματος, i.e. "those who were included in [the circle of those honoured with] a kiss," about a monster of sensuality, named Alexander. Possibly Lucian regarded Alexander as having borrowed from the Christians (though Alexander was opposed to them) this detail of their worship, and as having perverted it. A preceding chapter (*ib.* § 38) says that Alexander began his "mysteries" by proclaiming "Out with the Christians!"

Reasons of seemliness may have combined with textual reasons to induce John to omit the Synoptic tradition that Judas "betrayed with a kiss (πῶν)." See *Son* 3326 c, and add Ps. cxl. 7 "day of battle (πῶν)," explained (*Levy* iii. 453 a) by some as "arming" against the Messiah. This is more probable than the Greek corruption suggested in *Paradosis* 1365.

⁴ Philo i. 478—9 φιλημα δὲ διαφέρει τοῦ φιλεῖν. A "kiss" he calls ἐπιπάλαιον δεξιῶσιν.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

His disciples. Another condition was consecration. This, too, might be regarded as proceeding from Christ's lips when He was present in the Eucharist. Another was either parting or return after absence. This would be fulfilled with special reality when Jesus, after the Resurrection, fulfilled His promise, "I will see you again, and your joy no man taketh from you." When He came thus to "see" them "again," it is said by John that He "breathed into them" and said "Receive ye the Holy Spirit¹." Perhaps this might be regarded as, in some sense, the "kiss" of Christ. According to Jewish tradition, God "kissed" Moses when He drew forth his soul in a peaceful death². That might be called a kiss of parting, the work of life on earth being over. But the name might also be given to the kiss of return, when the Lord prepared His disciples for the work of the Gospel, touching their lips and comforting their hearts with the kiss of the Holy Spirit. And the disciples, having once received this kiss from their Master at their first Eucharist after the Resurrection, may have henceforth passed on the salutation from one to another at every Eucharist, as being the kiss "of love" and "holy³."

¹ See *Son* 3823 g—j on Jn xx. 22 ἐνεφύσητε.

² Deut. xxxiv. 5 Jer. Targ. Miriam also (*M. Kat.* 28 a) died by "God's kiss," Abraham (*Test. Abr.* § 20) by kissing the hand of the Angel of Death.

³ The thought of the *philtma*, or "kiss," as proceeding from Jesus leads us to the thought of the title *philoi*, or "friends," used by Jesus about His disciples. Luke is the only one of the Synoptists who represents Jesus as using it thus:—

Mt. x. 27—8

"What ye hear in the ear, proclaim upon the housetops; and be not afraid of them that kill the body...."

Lk. xii. 3—4

"What ye have spoken in the ear in the inner chambers shall be proclaimed upon the housetops; and I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body...."

In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus explains (Jn xv. 13—15) what He means when He says to the disciples "Ye are my friends." Friendship may imply dying for one's friend ("Greater love hath no man

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Even if we reject this explanation some of us may be benefited by being compelled to confess that there is beneath this ancient Christian rite something that needs to be explained. The explanation, whatever it may be, appears to involve the recognition of a personality in Jesus even more marvellous than we had supposed. Many believe easily enough in Christ's material miracles who do not realise His spiritual, social, and (so to speak) revolutionary miracles wrought on human nature. This "holy kiss" seems to represent a kind of high-water mark, reached at one rush by the religion of Christ during the period that followed His death, and perhaps to be reached again, after an interval of many centuries hereafter, but in a different way. Then it was reached by a visible Presence and an audible Voice. Hereafter the Presence may be not visible, and the Voice not audible, to the bodily sense. But in either case the Spirit will be the same, human yet divine, cosmopolitan yet homely, the Spirit of the Family of God breathed into God's children by God's Son¹.

than this") but such death is not a condition: "Ye are *my friends* if ye do the things that I command you." The term "*Caesar's friend*" was known to the mob (Jn xix. 12) in Jerusalem. Epictetus uses it repeatedly in his lecture on Freedom (iv. 1. 8—95) bidding his pupils not to seek freedom by gaining admission to the circle of "*Caesar's friends*" but (*ib.* 98) to "attach themselves to God." Luke's tradition, taken with the context ("kill the body") enables us to understand that there would be a tendency in the Christian Church to call the martyr "*Christ's friends*" in a special sense.

The conclusion of the Fourth Gospel (Jn xxi. 15—22) neutralises such a tendency. It shews that Peter, the future Martyr on the Cross, had no precedence in the matter of friendship, over the silent disciple "whom Jesus loved." The proof of Peter's affection demanded by Jesus is not expressed in an imperative "Then die for me," but in "Feed my sheep." In 3 Jn 14 (15), the expressions "*The friends salute thee*," and "*salute the friends*," are probably to be explained (from Jn xv. 14) as meaning "*the friends of the Lord [with me]*" and "*the friends of the Lord [with thee]*" (not "my friends" and "thy friends").

¹ Attention has been called (*Joh. Voc.* 1697, and Index) to the

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

§ 41. "Testament" or "Covenant"

The last two sections bear less directly on the miracles of feeding than on what appears to be their outcome. What follows will depart still further from the miracles and will turn itself toward the Eucharist. Not that we must permit ourselves to discuss so important a subject here out of its place. But in fact all the preceding forty sections have been leading us up, through the words "Give ye them to eat," to the question "What was Jesus Himself preparing to give us to eat?" Consequently, in taking our leave of the miracles of feeding, some reply to this question seems demanded.

fact that Mark never uses the word ἀγάπη. Hermas, who frequently resembles Mark, mentions ἀγάπη as a virtue thrice, twice connecting it with "understanding (φρόνησις)":—(Sim. ix. 17) "Having therefore received the seal, they had *one understanding*, and one mind, and their faith became one, and their *love one*," (ib. 18) "the church of God shall be one body, *one understanding*, one mind, one faith, *one love*." But he also uses it as a proper noun to denote the last of the Angels that build up the Church (Vis. iii. 8 (bis), comp. Sim. ix. 15). And here he regards it as proceeding "from Understanding," called Ἐπιστήμη. Ἀγάπη is called by the Greek Thesaurus "a mere Biblical word (vox mere biblica)." In LXX it is almost confined to Cant. and almost always has a sexual significance, but the Wisdom of Solomon applies it to man's love of God (iii. 9) and says that the beginning of wisdom is the desire of discipline, and (vi. 18) "the care (φρονesis) of discipline is *love*, and *love* is the keeping of her laws (ἀγάπη δὲ τήρησις νόμων αὐτῆς)." Comp. Jn xiv. 23 "if a man love me he will keep (τηρήσει) my word."

The Fourth Evangelist does not mention the noun "love" (Jn v. 42 "I know you, how that ye have not *the love of God* within you") till he has prepared his readers for it by connecting the verb with God as loving (iii. 16, 35) "the world" and "the Son." After that one mention of the noun, it is not mentioned again till the night before the Crucifixion where it is, in effect, defined (xiii. 34—5, xv. 9 foll.) as a unique love personified by Christ. The Gospel manifests not only a spiritual struggle to express an inexpressibly divine emotion, but also an intellectual attempt to rescue the word ἀγάπη from its Old Testament associations.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

We have seen above that John omits the words "Give ye them to eat." But we have been led to the conclusion that they were part of the earliest form of the narrative. If that is so, Jesus (we may suppose) was, even in those early days, training the disciples to "give" to the multitude, as, later on, He Himself was destined to "give" to the disciples in the Eucharist. What was that "gift"? As to part of it, all the Synoptists are agreed. They all tell us that He "gave" it with the words "This is my body." About this we shall say nothing here, since there is no disagreement. But as to another part there is a difference. Mark and Matthew indisputably represent Jesus as connecting the words "my blood" with a word (*diathēkē*) variously translated by our English Versions "covenant" or "testament," so that Jesus says "This is the blood of my *covenant* (or, *testament*)¹." Luke, in one version of his text, the one adopted by our Revised Version, has "This cup is the new *covenant* (or, *testament*) in my blood." But Westcott and Hort place this (and some of the context) in double brackets, as not being a part of the original text². Thus we are led to narrow down our question about the "gift" to a question, in the first place, as to the meaning attached by Jesus to the word *diathēkē*.

In LXX, the word *diathēkē* occurs for the first time in connection with the deluge by which God purposed to destroy mankind but to spare Noah: "Everything that is in the earth shall die, but I will establish my *covenant* with thee³." The

¹ Mk xiv. 24, Mt. xxvi. 28. Or the meaning may be (as R.V.) "This is my blood of the *covenant* (or, *testament*).¹" The Greek is τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης.

² Lk. xxii. 20. Curet. omits this. SS combines xxii. 17, 20 thus "...divide it among you; this is my blood, the new *testament*." For "*testament*," SS uses ܩܕܝܫܐ, a Syriac form of the Greek *διαθήκη*, which is regularly used for "testamentary disposition," "will" (*Thes. Syr.* 873). The word for "covenant," e.g. with Noah, Abraham, Israel, etc., is represented by Syr. ܩܕܝܫܐ = Heb. ברית (*Thes. Syr.* 3534).

³ Gen. vi. 17—18.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Hebrew for "covenant" is *berith*, meaning "compact," "alliance," "league," "agreement," "pledge of friendship." This is often well expressed by "covenant"—as when Joshua made a "covenant" with the Gibeonites at the time when he was purposing to destroy the Canaanites¹. But in the case of Noah's *berith*, as also often elsewhere, Aquila and Symmachus both substitute *sunthēkē* for *diathēkē*². And they appear to be justified. For *sunthēkē*, in Greek, regularly has the meanings of the Hebrew *berith*, that is, "compact," "agreement," etc.; *diathēkē* has not. The regular meaning of *diathēkē*—outside LXX and outside writings influenced by LXX—is "*last will and testament*"³.

¹ Josh. ix. 6—16, see Gesen. 136.

² They also substitute *συνθήκη* for LXX *διαθήκη* in Gen. xvii. 2 (the *BERITH* with Abraham). There Jerome says "Notandum quod ubicumque in Graeco *testamentum* legimus, ibi in Hebraeo sermone sit *foedus*, sive *pactum*, id est *BERITH*." Field, on Is. lvi. 6 (one of the very few instances where Aq. and Sym. are recorded to have used *διαθήκη*), says "Pro *διαθήκην* juxta usum binorum interpretum requiritur *συνθήκην*."

³ The only instance known to me of *διαθήκη* meaning "agreement," in Greek outside the sphere of LXX influence, is one quoted by Wetstein (on Mt. xxvi. 28) from Aristophanes (*Av.* 439). This is mentioned by Lightfoot (on Gal. iii. 15) as one of "some few exceptions." Westcott, who writes later, does not add any of these "exceptions" in his very long note on *Diathēkē* in *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. He says merely (p. 301) "The more general sense of 'arrangement,' 'agreement' is also found (*Arist. Av.* 440)." But Steph. *Thes.* gives no instance of "the more general sense" except the one from Aristophanes.

Josephus (*Ant.* xvii. 3. 2, xvii. 9. 7, *Bell.* ii. 2. 3) not only uses *diathēkē* several times for a "will," but also avoids using it in the phrase "the ark of the covenant," as, for example, in describing the passage of the Jordan by Joshua, and the capture of Jericho, where the phrase recurs frequently in Scripture. Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with the Jew, where he frequently quotes LXX, uses *διαθήκη* more than thirty times; but in his Apology, addressed to Greeks, he does not use it once; *De Monarch.* ii. 3 quotes from the *Diathēkai* of Orpheus, apparently regarded as meaning "*last instructions*"—a testamentary recantation. Hermas never uses *diathēkē*.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Philo affords conclusive evidence that the LXX application of the Greek *diathēkē* to the "covenants" of God with Noah and Abraham caused difficulty to students of the Greek text. Unfortunately his Greek comment on the *berith* with Noah is lost. When referring, however, to the *berith* with Abraham, he says "*Diathēkai* are written for the sake of those who are worthy of a free gift, so that a *diathēkē* is a symbol of grace¹." Then he says "About the whole subject of *diathēkai* I have written fully in two lectures, and I pass over the subject to avoid repeating myself." But he adds something that indicates (although briefly and obscurely) a connection in his mind between the *diathēkē* with Abraham and the "*inheritance*" promised to Abraham². "To one class of men," he says, "God holds forth benefits through earth, water, air, sun, moon, sky, [and] other incorporeal powers³,

¹ Philo i. 586 "a free gift (*δωρεάς*)."¹ This appears directed against the view that the *diathēkē* was a "compact," or "agreement." As a fact, the Hebrew, *berith*, does mean "compact." But the Greek *διαθήκη* does not.

² It should be noted that the Hebrew verb "*inherit* (עָרַךְ)" occurs for the first time in the Bible where God establishes His *berith* with Abraham: Gen. xv. 3—8 "One born in my house shall *inherit* me... shall not *inherit* thee... he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall *inherit* thee... to give thee this land to *inherit* it... Whereby shall I know that I shall *inherit* it?" In the preceding context, according to our R.V. text, God has promised Himself to Abraham (xv. 1) "I am... thy exceeding great reward." All this is above the level of "compacts" and "agreements" in the ordinary sense of the terms.

There is however no Hebrew noun—whether derived from עָרַךְ or otherwise—that represents the "bequeathing," or "testamentary disposition," of an inheritance. The Heb. verb נָתַן, "give [testamentary] instructions," is represented in Targ. by the Aram. verb נָתַן in 2 S. xvii. 23, 2 K. xx. 1, Is. xxxviii. 1; but the noun from נָתַן is not known to occur in Palestinian Aramaic, see below, p. 390, n.

³ Philo i. 587. Comp. Gal. iv. 3 "We were in bondage under the elements (*στοιχεῖα*) of the world," where however *στοιχεῖα* probably means "elements" in a metaphorical as well as in a literal sense.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

but to another class through Himself alone, *making Himself the inheritance of those who receive Him.*" All this is based on the utterance of God to Abraham, which Philo reads thus: "And I, behold, [am] my *diathēkē* with thee¹." He adds, as comment, "Now this suggests the following meaning. Though there are very many kinds of *diathēkē*, bestowing kindnesses (*lit.* graces) and free gifts on those who are worthy, yet the highest kind of *diathēkai* I MYSELF AM."

What Philo means—and especially what he means by "free gift" and "grace"—can hardly be understood unless we realise that by *diathēkē* he means, not "covenant" but "testament." By a "testament" a man may leave gifts and legacies to friends, servants, and dependants, but the highest form of it is that by which a father leaves "his real estate" to his son, who is to succeed him after the testator's death. God cannot die. Nevertheless God makes Abraham His "heir," and bequeaths to him, so to speak, His "real estate," His own personal presence, Himself. This conclusion as to Philo's meaning is confirmed by a Latin fragment of a comment of his on God's *diathēkē* with Noah: "In the case of men an inheritance transmitted by them is possessed [by the heir then, and only then] when the men themselves exist no longer but are dead. But on the other hand God, since He is everlasting, *concedes to the wise a joint participation in the inheritance that He transmits [to them while He is still living]*, and He rejoices at their entering into possession of it²."

¹ Gen. xvii. 4 καὶ ἐγὼ ἰδοὺ ἡ διαθήκη μου μερὰ σοῦ. This may be variously punctuated. Clem. Alex. 427 quotes ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ (sic) ἡ διαθήκη μου μερὰ σοῦ as a proof that "Moses manifestly calls the Lord a *diathēkē*."

² Philo *Quaest. in Gen.* (on Gen. vi. 18 "I will establish my covenant with thee"). The comment concludes as follows: "Secundo ampliorem quandam largitur sapienti haereditatem. Non enim dixit *Ponam foedus meum tibi*, sed *te*: id est, Tu es justum verumque foedus, quod statuam generi rationali pro possessione ac decore quibus opus est virtutis." I am unable to explain this. The

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

In this last passage, about the *diathēkē* with Noah, we see Philo apparently influenced, partly by the natural meaning of the Greek word (namely, "testament"), and partly by the thought of the subsequent *diathēkē* with Abraham, so that he imports into the transaction with Noah a meaning that the Hebrew can hardly justify. As to the motives of the LXX in using *diathēkē* to render *berith* we cannot speak confidently. It is possible that they avoided *sunthēkē*, the correct rendering, because the thought of God as making a "compact" or "treaty" with man seemed too anthropomorphic. In the illustrious instances of Noah and Abraham, the LXX may have felt justified in attempting to force into the Hebrew word some higher thought—taking *diathēkē* to mean not exactly a "will" but a "deed of gift." Then this precedent may have been followed by them in subsequent instances, for consistency's sake, where the Hebrew could not have that meaning.

At this stage, after these repeated mentions of "testament" in Greek, before we pass to the Gospels, it will be well to ask, "How would a Jew of the first century in Palestine express himself in Aramaic, if he wished to say 'This is my *last will and testament*'?" The answer is important and to some it may be surprising. The Jew could not possibly express this by "This is my *berith*" any more than we in English could express it by "This is my *treaty*." He would have to say "This is my *diathēkē*," using a Hebraized form of the Greek word. Abundant instances of this use are given by Levy and Krauss. Babylonian Jews might have used another word (apparently of rare occurrence); but Palestinian Jews appear to have had practically no other¹.

heading of the comment is "Quid est Statuam foedus meum tecum?" The expression "I will give [i.e. appoint] thee for a covenant" occurs in Isaiah xlii. 6, xlix. 8; but Philo hardly ever quotes prophecy, and there is no various reading of *to* for *tecum* (or *tibi*) in renderings of Gen. vi. 18.

¹ See Levy, Levy Ch., Krauss, and *Theo. Syr.* on רִיתִיקָא or 389 (Mark vi. 29—44)

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Now coming to the Epistles we perceive that the Epistle to the Hebrews definitely says "For wherever there is a *diathēkē* there the death of the maker-of-the-*diathēkē* must of necessity have its course (lit. *be brought*), for a *diathēkē* [is as it were] based on dead persons¹." The Epistle to the Galatians takes the *diathēkē* with Abraham expressly out of the region of "law," and by implication out of the region of "compact," into the region of "heirs" and "promise" and "faith," when, after insisting on the unalterableness of a human *diathēkē*², it goes on to say "A *diathēkē* [such as that with Abraham] confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of no effect.... But before faith came we were kept in ward under the law.... And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise³." In the light of these two passages we perceive that elsewhere, when Paul speaks of God's *diathēkē* with Abraham he not only does not include the thought of "compact," but excludes it and implies God's "free gift" (as

פְּרָאִי used *passim* for "a will." Levy iv. 88 a gives one instance of the phrase "a writing of פְּקָדוֹת," i.e. "a writing of last instructions," "a will," in *Git.* 50 b. But I am informed by Dr A. Büchler that this is in a discussion of Babylonian scholars and that he knows no instance of it in Palestinian Aramaic. Levy i. 404 quotes, *inter alia*, *J. Berach.* v. 9 b, where God is represented as saying that He gave the dew to Abraham "in a *diathēkē*," where Schwab has (p. 101) "C'est à titre immuable que j'en ai fait don à Abraham" (comp. Gal. iii. 15 foll. on the unalterableness of the *diathēkē* with Abraham). But it means "deed of gift" in *Gen.* v., on *Gen.* xxiv. 10 "All the good[s] of his master was in his hand," where the comment is "This means a *diathēkē*," i.e. a deed of disposition by which Abraham, while still living, made over his property to his servant in trust for Isaac. This is exceptional. Neither here nor elsewhere do Levy's instances indicate that the Hebrew *diathēkē* was used to mean "bargain," "treaty," or "compact."

¹ Heb. ix. 16—17.

² Gal. iii. 15.

³ Gal. iii. 17—29.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING .

Philo does) and the thought of a Father bequeathing an inheritance to sons¹.

In dealing with the Law of Moses Paul labours under great difficulties. The LXX so frequently calls it a *diathēkē* that Paul is obliged to do the same. But he explains it as a testamentary disposition of an inferior character given to Israel for a time—almost as if he were Ishmael not Isaac—for “So long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a bondservant².” This *diathēkē* is both old and new. Relatively to the Christian *diathēkē*, it is old and ready to be superseded. Relatively to the Promise, it is “new,” but not in a good sense—being the *diathēkē* of Sinai, which “beareth children unto bondage,” a novel though necessary makeshift. It cannot invalidate the ancient and unalterable *diathēkē* of God bequeathing Himself to Abraham His son and heir³.

¹ Comp. Rom. ix. 4 “Whose is the adoption and the glory and the *diathēkai*,” ib. xi. 27 “this is the *diathēkē* from me to them (comp. Is. lix. 21) when I shall take away their sins.” The Epistle to the Hebrews (viii. 8—10) quotes Jeremiah (xxxi. 31—3) as predicting that God will make “a new *diathēkē*” for Israel, “I will put my law in their inward parts and in their heart will I write it, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.” This is in Paul’s mind as the true *diathēkē*, the fulfilment of the *diathēkē* with Abraham and Isaac “the heir.” The *diathēkē* of Sinai (Gal. iv. 24) “bearing children unto bondage” is represented by Hagar. That, too, is a legacy of a kind, since Ishmael is Abraham’s child, but it is of an inferior kind.

² Gal. iv. 1.

³ See 2 Cor. iii. 6—14 ἡμᾶς διακόνους καιῆς διαθήκης...ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. Eph. ii. 12 ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, appears to mean “strangers to the *diathēkē* of the promise to Abraham in all the forms in which it was given to him and confirmed to his successors.” For the remaining Pauline instance “this is the new *diathēkē* in my blood” see below, § 42. The instances in the Epistle to the Hebrews—where both meanings are intermixed—are too frequent to be quoted.

§ 42. "Testament" in the Gospels

Passing now to the Gospels we find that, apart from the narratives of the Eucharist, their evidence is almost entirely negative, since the word occurs but once, namely, in the Song of Zacharias "To remember his holy *diathēkē*, the oath that he swore unto our father Abraham¹." Jesus repeatedly speaks of "the law," but never of the *diathēkē* of God, either with Abraham, or with Israel at Mount Sinai. Nor does any evangelist use the word, when writing in his own person.

In the accounts of the Eucharist the texts vary greatly. The Revised Version gives a longer Lucan text including a phrase that contains the word *diathēkē*, and closely agreeing with a Pauline passage that includes the same phrase². Westcott and Hort give a shorter Lucan text omitting the phrase and containing no mention of *diathēkē*³. Also, in Mark and Matthew, Westcott and Hort reject "new" as applied to *diathēkē*. The Revised Version, although it says that "some ancient authorities" insert *new* in Mark, and that "many" insert it in Matthew, nevertheless does not itself insert *new* in either Gospel.

This omission of "new" makes all the difference in the interpretation of *diathēkē*. If "new" had been part of the text, we might have supposed the meaning to be "This is my blood of the New Covenant, or the blood of my New Covenant, as distinguished from the blood of the Old Covenant which was given to Israel on Mount Sinai." Even with the addition of "new," such a doctrine would seem abrupt and almost startling—especially in view of the fact that Jesus is not

¹ Lk. i. 72—3.

² Lk. xxii. 20 "This cup is the new *diathēkē* in my blood," comp. 1 Cor. xi. 25.

³ W.H. pass from Lk. xxii. 19 "This is my body" to Lk. xxii. 21 "But behold, the hand . . .," bracketing "that is given for you . . . that is shed for you."

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

recorded in any Gospel to have ever previously mentioned the word thus interpreted "covenant," either to the multitude or to the disciples. But, without the addition of "new," the meaning "covenant" seems quite impossible.

That being the case, we are led to accept, as probable, an explanation based on the demonstrated meaning of the Palestinian Aramaic word *diathēkē*, namely, "last will and testament." There may possibly have been some allusion to the *diathēkē* in Sinai¹. But much more probably there was no allusion at all to that or to anything else in the Old Testament. It was an utterance of personal affection and of divine conviction. Using the language habitual in Palestine, Jesus said to His disciples, "This is the blood that signifies my death and yet not my severance from you. This is the blood of my last will and testament in which, though dying, I bequeath to you my life and presence in perpetuity²."

Here we must add that although Mark and Matthew do not represent Jesus as speaking of a "*new diathēkē*" in connection with "cup" or "blood," they do represent Him as using the word "*new*" in connection with the act of drinking

¹ Comp. Exod. xxiv. 8 ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς δίδωτο Κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων τῶν λόγων τούτων. These words Christians would naturally connect with Christ in after times, as they are connected in Heb. ix. 19, 20 etc. And the tradition peculiar to Luke and added by him a little later on (xxii. 29) καὶ γὰρ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν... βασιλείαν (perhaps referring to the crown to be gained by the blood of martyrdom) may be an allusion to the διαθήκη of Sinai. But the words of Institution seem best interpreted as a simple, direct, non-allusive and personal utterance in which Jesus bequeathed Himself to His disciples.

² This conclusion—rejecting the word "new"—is compatible with a grateful acknowledgment of the value of the Pauline tradition (1 Cor. xi. 23 "received from the Lord") concerning the *meaning* of the Eucharist, as being something that was to be "done in remembrance" of the Lord, and also concerning the relation of it, as a "new" and higher "testament," to the old and inferior one. But the Pauline tradition has no claim to be regarded as more faithful than that of Mark and Matthew to Christ's original words.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

from a "cup" at the Eucharist¹. The parallel Luke, though in other respects closely similar to Mark and Matthew, omits "new²." John therefore is bound (according to the Rule of Johannine Intervention) to insert something about "newness," equivalent—from a Johannine point of view—to what Mark and Matthew have about "not drinking from *the offspring of the vine*" until Jesus shall "drink it *new*" in "the kingdom of God" (or, as Matthew has it, "the kingdom of my Father").

Starting, then, from the Synoptic "*offspring of the vine*," we ask for some equivalent in John. Origen, when commenting on "*the offspring of the vine*," in Matthew, asks "What vine?" He replies (from John) "That vine of which He Himself [*i.e.* Jesus] was the figure, saying *I am the Vine, ye the branches*. Whence He says again *My blood is truly*

¹ Mk xiv. 25

Mt. xxvi. 29

Lk. xxii. 18

Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the offspring of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this offspring of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.

For I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the offspring of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.

The columns follow R.V., except in rendering *γέννημα* "offspring" instead of "fruit." The formula for "blessing over the wine" was *Berach. 35 a* (Mishna) "Blessed [is] He that created *the fruit* (רֵב) of the vine," and the usual Greek for רֵב is *καρπός*. But in Deut. and Isaiah it is sometimes rendered *γέννημα*.

* Luke has also a corresponding utterance of Jesus about "eating," peculiar to his Gospel (xxii. 16) "I will assuredly not eat it [where "it" refers to (xxii. 15) "this Passover"] until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." There, too, Luke omits "*new*."

The importance attached to "*the cup*" may be illustrated by the tradition in *Pesach. 106 a* "The Rabbis said that (Exod. xx. 8) *Remember the Sabbath* meant *Remember it over the wine*." This "remembering" was a part of the "Hallowing of the Sabbath," a domestic rite known to have been practised before, and probably long before, the days of Hillel and Shammai.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

drink... For truly He *'washed His robe in the blood of the grape¹.'*"

Now all would agree that the blood of Jesus represents His "love" ("greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends²"). And the love of Jesus is regarded in the Fourth Gospel as a new kind of love. At the conclusion of His prayer to the Father for the disciples, Jesus says that He will make the Father's name known to them, "that *the love wherewith thou lovedst me* may be in them, and I in them³"; and He has previously defined this love in "a new commandment" to the disciples. Their love is to be like His love: "*A new commandment* give I unto you, that ye love one another—even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another⁴."

Does not this "new commandment," in John, correspond to the "new wine," in Mark and Matthew? That the epithet "new" is emphatic is confirmed, not only by the context, but also by the play on "new" and "old" in the Johannine Epistle⁵, and by the fact that, apart from narrative, this is the only instance of the epithet in the whole of the Fourth Gospel⁶. Some may object that "commandment" implies constraint. "Love," they may say, "must not be commanded." That is not an objection that would be felt to be a serious one by John or by any spiritually-minded Jew, who would accept as God's gifts the two "great" commandments of the Law. God's

¹ Origen *Levit. Hom.* vii. 2 (Lomm. ix. 292—3) quoting Mt. xxvi. 29, Jn xv. 5, vi. 55, Gen. xlix. 11. Comp. *Didach.* § 9 "First, about the cup:—We give thanks to thee, our Father, for the holy *Vine* of David thy servant (*παῖδος*), which thou madest known to us through Jesus thy servant (*παῖδος*)."

² Jn xv. 13.

³ Jn xvii. 26.

⁴ Jn xiii. 34. There would be nothing "new" in the commandment "love your neighbours," or "love one another," but there was something "new" in the kind of love.

⁵ The commandment was (1 Jn ii. 7) "not new" and yet (*ib.* 8) "on the other hand new."

⁶ Jn xix. 4 "a new tomb" is the only other instance.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

commandments are affectionate imperatives, like the Pauline paraphrase "Be ye reconciled unto God¹." They come to us appealing for love—love toward God the Father, and love toward men the brethren. And, coming to us through the Son, they convey to us, if we will receive them in the Spirit of the Son, a power to respond to the appeal. Hence, in the Fourth Gospel, a "commandment" is regarded as something "given" by the Father to the Son, and even as being "eternal life²." The final mention of the word by Jesus indicates, so to speak, an appropriation of the Commandment of Love by the Son: "This is my very own commandment, that ye love one another³." By using "commandment" and not the ambiguous *diathēkē*, John avoids all notion of "covenanting" or "bargaining." And yet he also avoids any expressions that imply unconditional "giving" to those who are incapable of "receiving" the gift.

No Gospel inculcates more consistently than the Fourth the necessity of something real at heart and spiritually solid, incompatible with nebulous mysticism or inflated bubbles of profession. Conditions—of act as well as thought—are not only expressed but also reiterated. "If ye have love one to another," and "If ye do that which I command you," are but two out of many specimens⁴. Our expectation, then, that John would intervene—so far as concerns the Marcan tradition, certainly omitted by Luke, about the "newness" of the wine that was to be drunk by Jesus after His death—appears to be justified. We have no right to push our expectation further and to claim that John should intervene about the Marcan *diathēkē* to tell us whether it meant "testament" or

¹ 2 Cor. v. 20.

² Jn xii. 49, 50.

³ Jn xv. 12. On the emphasis of ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ ἐμὴ see *Joh. Gr.*, Index ἐμὴ.

⁴ See *ἐὰν* in Jn xiii. 17, 35, xiv. 15, 23, xv. 7, 10, 14.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

"covenant." For, as we have seen, it is not certain that Luke omits this word.

Nevertheless we may say with confidence that, all through Christ's Last Discourse and Last Prayer, John is endeavouring to set before us the Son as playing (so to speak) the part of a Testator in behalf of the Father. In the Father's name, He is bequeathing Himself to mankind. The difficulty pointed out by Philo—that God the Father cannot die, so as to make a "testament" in the ordinary way—disappears in the Person of the incarnate Son. The Son could die. Since He could die He could make a "testament" as Mark and Matthew apparently say that He did. The difficulty for John, therefore, consisted, not in the actual words of Jesus, but in the interpretations of them by Christians, who might confuse "testament" with "covenant," or might give to both terms formal and unspiritual significations.

In the Fourth Gospel this danger is avoided partly by negative means—by avoiding the word "testament." But far more importance attaches to the positive means—the introduction of a substitute that could not possibly be reduced to the level of a technical term. This substitute—which reminds us of the promise to Abraham as interpreted above, "And I, behold, [am] my *diathēkē* with thee"—is a personal Testament, a Paraclete, an Alter Ego, or Second Self, who is to represent the Son after His departure and to recall the Son's acts and words and strengthening presence, with increased power. Thus, without hearing from His lips any such words as "This is my testament," we see Jesus revealed to us in this Gospel as standing in the midst of His troubled followers on the eve of His departure from them, and bestowing on them a Testament of a new kind, no less "new" than His love. It is a Testament indeed yet not a writing. It is a spiritual Friend sent to take His place in their orphaned hearts, and to breathe into them the assurance that although absent He is present and that they are not orphans in the

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

comfort of His perpetual presence: "Peace I leave unto you, my own peace I give unto you, not as the world giveth give I unto you." "I will not leave you orphans; I come unto you¹."

In the preceding remarks about the language of the Eucharist nothing has been said about the fact that this language was misunderstood as early as the days of Nero, and gave rise to accusations against the Christian religion that were credited by all classes, educated as well as uneducated. Tacitus, writing about Nero's persecution of the Christians, calls them "hateful because of their shameful crimes," guilty of "hatred of the human race," practising "a deadly superstition," and deserving of "the severest punishments"—and this even in Rome, "the resort of all things abominable and shameful²." Suetonius perhaps assumes all this when he more briefly says that Nero, along with other measures of wholesome reform, "punished Christians, a class of men given up to a new and maleficent superstition³."

We have evidence as to the nature of the "shameful crimes (*flagitia*)" imputed to the Christians by everybody and believed in by Tacitus. In large measure, they sprang out of distorted reports of the Christian Eucharist, which was regarded as a "Thyestean banquet⁴." Thyestes fed on the flesh of his own son. The language of Christians describing the Father as giving the flesh and blood of the Son for the life of the world, could easily be taken literally even by honest pagans, and still more

¹ Jn xiv. 27, 18.

² Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44.

³ Suet. *Ner.* § 16.

⁴ See Athenagoras (before 177 A.D.) § 3 "Three things are alleged against us, atheism, Thyestean feasts, Œdipodean intercourse." Atheism would be inferred from the refusal of Christians to worship the Greek and Roman gods, Œdipodean intercourse might be inferred from mystical language about the Church as the Bride of the Son.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

easily by enemies and spies. The Second Apology of Justin Martyr mentions the charge of feasting on human flesh in connection with "mysteries of Cronos¹." "Thyestean banquets" are mentioned both by Athenagoras and by the Elders of the Church of Lyons (writing about the persecution under Verus) in such a way as to shew that they were accusations of long standing². Such "banquets" are almost certainly included in the "shameful crimes" mentioned by Tacitus.

How could the Fourth Evangelist deal with falsehoods of this kind, while still preserving unimpaired the spiritual reality expressed in the passionate language of the Eucharist as proceeding from Christ: "This is my body," "This is my blood"? To an educated Greek, like Plutarch, such language might suggest the *ômophagiai*—that is, the "eatings of raw flesh (or, living creatures)"—practised in their "mysteries" by some of the worshippers of Bacchus³. No doubt a Bacchic dance seems to us a thing that could not conceivably be connected even by the bitterest foes of the Christians with the celebration of the Eucharist. But the Acts of John takes a different view. On the night before the crucifixion, it tells us, Jesus bade the disciples form a circle, Himself standing in the centre, and they "danced" round Him in response to His "dancing⁴." If a Christian

¹ Justin Mart. 2 *Apol.* § 12, mentioning Κρόνου μυστήρια, i.e. sacrifices of children (connected in the Bible with Moloch).

² Euseb. v. 1. 14, and see Iren. *Fragm.* 13.

³ Plutarch, *De Defect. Orac.* § 14 (*Mor.* 417 C) ἑορτὰς δὲ καὶ θυσίας . . . ἐν αἷς ὠμοφαγαίαι καὶ διασπασμοί . . . θεῶν μὲν οὐδενὶ δαιμόνων δὲ φαύλων ἀποτροπῆς ἕνεκα φήσαιμ' ἂν τελείσθαι. This is the earliest mention of ὠμοφαγία given by Steph. *Thes.* The next is from Clem. Alex. 12 "The bacchanals hold their orgies in honour of the frenzied Dionysus, celebrating their sacred frenzy by the eating of raw flesh, and go through the distribution of the parts of butchered victims. . . ." Plutarch does not mention "Dionysus" as Clement does, but says, in effect, that such rites, even if nominally consecrated to a god, were really addressed to demons.

⁴ *Acts of John*, §§ 11—12 mentions χορεύω and χορεία seven times, besides ὀρχοῦμαι and σκιρτάω.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

Gnostic could write thus about the Christian Eucharist, might not a Roman historian like Tacitus, or a literary Greek like Plutarch, be excused for going a little further and for supposing that the Christians practised a "mystery" in which they actually tore to pieces and devoured human flesh?

Until we realise the fact that from the days of Luke to those of Tertullian Christians in the arena were scoffed at in torture and death, as being monsters who butchered little children and "left a bite in their bloodstained bread¹," we shall not realise the task set before the author of the Fourth Gospel. Luke had greatly altered the language of Eucharistic Institution—perhaps by paraphrase, or perhaps, if the longer text is altogether rejected, by omission; but he had written nothing bearing on the Eucharist in a positive way so as to vindicate the Christians from an accusation that seemed no less true to the accusers than it seems absurd to us.

What was needed was some expansion and full explanation of that which Jesus actually did say, something that might compel a dispassionate and educated Greek or Roman reader like Plutarch or Pliny, to confess: "After all, it seems that this man Christos did not mean 'flesh' literally. He was not speaking calmly; he was not speaking like a philosopher; he did not preserve a calm tranquillity as Socrates did up to the very moment of drinking the hemlock; he seems to have lost his presence of mind when face to face with death; but at all events he did not encourage his followers to tear and devour human flesh."

John, on the other hand, does seem to have included in his Gospel some such vindication of the Christians. He places it, however, not on the night preceding the Crucifixion but long before. And he does it in an indirect and unexpected way. He represents Jesus as *actually using language that Gentiles might naturally take in a literal sense* as referring to *ômophagia*—and this, in an atmosphere of calm when there was no thought of

¹ Tertull. *Apol.* § 7, *Ad Nat.* i. § 7.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

impending death. Later on, when death does actually impend, he represents Jesus as using no such language: for then, on the night before His death, His thoughts turn not on Himself, nor on the immortality of His own soul (like the thoughts of Socrates) but on the future welfare of the disciples to whom He is bequeathing His legacy of love. But here, at this earlier stage, Jesus utters fervent and strange language—strange to Jews as well as to Greeks and Romans—about “feeding” on His “flesh” and “blood,” to express in metaphor the transference from Himself to others of a vital and vitalising personality. “Flesh and blood,” among the Jews, was a phrase representing human weakness as contrasted with divine strength. The Son of God had taken upon Himself, or into Himself, human weakness—human “flesh” and human “blood”—in order to transmit it to the sons of men as divine strength, according to the word of God “My strength is made perfect in weakness.”

At the same time John does not conceal from us the fact that this metaphor was misunderstood even from the first, not only by Jews in general but also by Christ's own disciples. Jesus Himself perceives this misunderstanding but will not on that account soften or attenuate the truth. His disciples must rise up to it. He will not draw it down to them: “It is the spirit that quickeneth. The flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken unto you are [indeed] spirit and are [indeed] life¹.”

Coming as they do after the exclamation “How can this man give us *his flesh* to eat?” and after the explanation given by Jesus which the disciples still find difficult, the words “*the flesh* profiteth nothing” seem intended to have a twofold meaning. Jesus seems to mean, not only, “*the fleshly or material view of things* is unprofitable,” but also “*the flesh about which I spoke to you* when I said ‘Except ye eat *the flesh of the Son of*

¹ Jn vi. 63.

CHRIST'S MIRACLES OF FEEDING

man'—this, in a literal sense, and regarded materially, is of no profit." But this must be admitted to be doubtful. What is hardly doubtful—or at all events cannot be dismissed as improbable—is the conclusion that the Johannine version of Christ's discourse, taken in its context, and with an appreciation of the circumstances, was adapted to open the eyes of any educated Greek or Roman to the falsity of the popular charge against the Christians that they celebrated in their mysteries "Thyestean feasts" and fed on the "raw flesh" of human beings.

ADDENDUM

The connection between the Synoptic doctrine of the Sacrifice on the Cross and the Johannine doctrine of the Living Bread is illustrated by the following hymn:

To sacrifice, to share,
To give as Jesus gave,
For others' wants to care,
Not our own lives to save,—

This is the Living Bread
Which cometh down from heaven,
Wherewith our souls are fed,
The pure, immortal leaven.

The hidden Manna this,
Whereof who eateth, he
Grows up in perfectness
Of Christlike symmetry.

Who seeks this bread shall be
Nor stinted nor denied:
Our hungry souls in thee
O Christ, are satisfied!

From *The St Olave's Hymnal*, p. 379 (LUCY LARCOM).

CHAPTER IX

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

[Mark vi. 45—52]

§ I. *The sequel of the Feeding of the Five Thousand*¹

CHRIST'S Walking on the Sea is not related by Luke. Consequently, so far as concerns the Rule of Johannine Intervention,

¹ For convenience of reference, R.V. is given at full length below, as usual, but in detailed comment it is frequently departed from. In Mt. xiv. 24, R.V. marg. "many furlongs" etc. (which is W.H. txt) is accepted as probably correct.

Mk vi. 45—52

(45) And straightway he constrained his disciples to enter into the boat, and to go before [him] unto the other side to Bethsaida, while he himself sendeth the multitude away.

(46) And after he had taken leave of them, he departed into the mountain to pray.

(47) And when even was come, the boat was in the midst of the sea, and he alone on the land.

(48) And seeing them distressed in rowing, for the wind was contrary unto them, about the fourth watch of the night he cometh unto them, walking on the sea; and he would have passed by them:

(49) But they,

Mt. xiv. 22—33

(22) And straightway he constrained the disciples to enter into the boat, and to go before him unto the other side, till he should send the multitudes away.

(23) And after he had sent the multitudes away, he went up into the mountain apart to pray: and when even was come, he was there alone.

(24) But the boat was now in the midst of the sea (*some anc. auth.* was many furlongs distant from the land), distressed by the waves; for the wind was contrary.

(25) And in the fourth watch of the night he came unto them, walking upon the sea.

(26) And when

Jn vi. 15—21

(15) Jesus therefore perceiving that they were about to come and take him by force, to make him king, withdrew again into the mountain himself alone.

(16) And when evening came, his disciples went down unto the sea;

(17) And they entered into a boat, and were going over the sea unto Capernaum. And it was now dark, and Jesus had not yet come to them:

(18) And the sea was rising by reason of a great wind that blew.

(19) When therefore they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs, they behold Jesus walking on the

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

we are spared the necessity of examining Mark's text, phrase

Mk vi. 45—52
contd.

when they saw him walking on the sea, supposed that it was an apparition, and cried out:

(50) For they all saw him, and were troubled. But he straightway spake with them, and saith unto them, Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid.

(51) And he went up unto them into the boat; and the wind ceased: and they were sore amazed in themselves;

(52) For they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened.

Mt. xiv. 22—33
contd.

the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is an apparition; and they cried out for fear.

(27) But straightway Jesus spake unto them, saying, Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.

(28) And Peter answered him and said, Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee upon the waters.

(29) And he said, Come. And Peter went down from the boat, and walked upon the waters, to come (*some anc. auth. and came*) to Jesus.

(30) But when he saw the wind (*many anc. auth. add strong*), he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried out, Lord, save me.

(31) And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and took hold of him, and saith unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?

(32) And when they were gone up into the boat, the wind ceased.

(33) And they that were in the boat worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God.

Jn vi. 15—21
contd.

sea, and drawing nigh unto the boat: and they were afraid.

(20) But he saith unto them, It is I; be not afraid.

(21) They were willing therefore to receive him into the boat: and straightway the boat was at the land whither they were going.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

by phrase, to note what Luke alters or omits. There are, however, reasons why Marcan details should not be passed over. In particular, the introduction to the Walking on the Sea, that is to say, the sequel of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, claims attention, because it marks a line where Luke breaks away from Mark and Matthew and leaves them altogether for a considerable interval.

This interval may be called the Period of Suspense. It begins shortly after the execution of John the Baptist and lasts till the Confession of Peter and the Transfiguration, when Jesus definitely resolves to go up and meet the end in Jerusalem. During this interval Jesus seems to have become an object of suspicion to Herod Antipas, who feared that Jesus might attempt to avenge the Baptist's death; unpopular with the multitude, because He did not attempt to avenge it; and disappointing to many of His own disciples, who found Him unpractical and fanciful, departing from all the precedents of the ancient Deliverers of Israel, and failing to satisfy their Messianic expectations. This part of His life He spent (according to Mark and Matthew) moving about from place to place in North Palestine, reaching Tyre and Sidon on the West, and finally Caesarea on the East, a city in the tetrarchy of Philip, which was called distinctively Caesarea Philippi. Here he was not under the jurisdiction of Herod Antipas, nor under that of Pilate, and here it was that He received the confession of Peter and, shortly afterwards, resolved to go up to Jerusalem¹.

¹ Luke (ix. 51—3) represents Christ's resolution to go up to Jerusalem as a reason why Samaritans rejected Him. But this would call forth the zeal of Jewish disciples and followers (comp. *ib.* 57); and some one, not a follower, is described (*ib.* 49—50) as casting out devils in His name and as being "not against" Jesus. The preceding disputes of the disciples about supremacy (*ib.* 46) shew that they believed Him to be about to assert the claims of the Son of David. The appeal "thou Son of David" is recorded by all the Synoptists as uttered when Jesus passed through Jericho on His way to Jerusalem (Mk x. 46) "with his disciples and a great multitude." All this

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

Then He appears to have regained His popularity with the multitude, but the rulers of the Jews feared and hated Him more than ever.

Luke tells us nothing of all these wanderings in North Palestine. But he gives us glimpses of reasons that might cause them. When rumours arose about Jesus as the Baptist's successor, Luke tells us significantly that Herod "sought to see" Him¹. The Pharisees also, in Luke, warn Jesus, "Get thee out"—presumably from Galilee or Peraea—"and go hence, for Herod would fain kill thee²." And Luke has previously said "There were some present at that very time who brought word to him [*i.e.* Jesus] about the Galilaeans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices³." This implies a warning against going into Pilate's jurisdiction. But Luke describes Jesus as rejecting both warnings, and as persevering in His resolution to go up to the City, "because it is not possible that a prophet should perish out of Jerusalem⁴."

None of these details, whether those peculiar to Mark and Matthew or those peculiar to Luke, are mentioned by John⁵. But he throws light on the period as a whole by telling us that the multitude sought to make Jesus "king" and that Jesus "withdrew" from them⁶. Thus he makes us see both why Herod Antipas would suspect Jesus and why the multitude would be disappointed in Him. At the same time we receive the impression that the radical cause of Christ's unpopularity

indicates that from the time when Jesus decided to go to Jerusalem He regained popularity.

¹ Lk. ix. 9.

² Lk. xiii. 31.

³ Lk. xiii. 1.

⁴ Lk. xiii. 33.

⁵ In almost all the passages where John mentions Judaea it is as a region from which Jesus departs to avoid the jealousy of the Jews (iv. 3, rep. 47, 54), or to avoid persecution (vii. 1), or to which He proposes to return at the peril of His life (xi. 7). The only exception (and a very strange one) is where His brethren say (vii. 3) "go to Judaea."

⁶ Jn vi. 15.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

and of the withdrawal of almost all His disciples was the mysterious and personal character of His teaching. To spiritual incompatibility John attributes the attempts to kill Jesus, which all emanate from "the Jews," that is, in effect, the rulers of the people, to whom Christ's "word" was not a "seed" but "a stone of stumbling¹."

As regards the details of the narrative of the Walking on the Sea, although there is no parallel Luke to occupy us, there are important deviations of Matthew and John from Mark which (besides being interesting in themselves) may explain why Luke omitted the whole. The narrative seems to suggest a spiritual storm of doubt and temptation besetting the disciples, besides describing a material storm of wind and waves. And we shall find Matthew intensifying this aspect of doubt and temptation by introducing a story (not mentioned by Mark) of Peter attempting to walk on the waves and failing because he doubted. But before discussing these matters it will be well to have before us a summary of all the Mark-Matthew traditions from which Luke, at this point, breaks away. They constitute what may be entitled "Christ's journeying in North Palestine."

§ 2. *Christ's journeying in North Palestine*

After the Feeding of the Five Thousand, Mark, Matthew and John agree that Jesus went up "*into the mountain*," and that He was there "*alone*." Mark and Matthew add (but John does not) that He went thither "*to pray*." Luke's next words do indeed mention "*praying*" and "*alone*," but not

¹ Jn v. 18, vii. 1—35. Incompatibility is implied in viii. 37 "Ye seek to kill me because my word hath not free course in you." Comp. Wisd. ii. 13—14 "He professeth to have the knowledge of God and he calleth himself the child of the Lord. He was made to reprove our thoughts."

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

"mountain," and they are parallel, not to the Marcan tradition under consideration, but to one that comes much later:—

Mk viii. 27	Mt. xvi. 13	Lk. ix. 18
And Jesus came- forth and his dis- ciples into the <i>villages</i> of <i>Caesarea Philippi</i> , and on the way....	But Jesus having come into <i>the parts of</i> <i>Caesarea Philippi</i>	And it came to pass when he was <i>praying alone</i>

Before this mention of "Caesarea Philippi," and after the Feeding of the Five Thousand, Mark mentions other places which it will be convenient to enumerate here:—

Mk vi. 45	Mt. xiv. 22	Jn vi. 16—17
He constrained his disciples to enter into the boat and to go before [him] unto <i>the other side to Beth-</i> <i>saida</i>	He constrained the disciples to enter into the boat and to go before him <i>unto</i> <i>the other side</i>	His disciples went down unto the sea and they entered in- to a boat and were going over the sea unto <i>Capernaum</i>

There are no parallels to the following:—

Mk vi. 53	Mt. xiv. 34	Lk. om.
They came to <i>the</i> <i>land, unto Gennes-</i> <i>aret</i>	They came to <i>the</i> <i>land, unto Gennes-</i> <i>aret</i> .	

This is closely followed, in Mark, by a mention of Jesus as going into "villages and cities," and healing, and subsequently rebuking the Pharisees and teaching the multitude. Then, it is said, more definitely:—

Mk vii. 24	Mt. xv. 21	Lk. om.
But from thence he arose and went away into the borders of <i>Tyre</i> [<i>and Sidon</i>] ¹ .	And Jesus came out thence, and with- drew into the parts of <i>Tyre and Sidon</i> .	

¹ "And Sidon" is bracketed by W.H.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

Jesus is here in the region entered by Elijah when the Lord said to him "Arise, get thee to Zarephath, which belongeth to Zidon... behold, I have commanded a widow woman there to sustain thee"; but whereas Elijah was sustained by the woman, Jesus, metaphorically, feeds a woman with what are described as "*the children's crumbs*¹." Then Jesus returns to the sea of Galilee.

Mk vii. 31

And again having come forth from the borders of Tyre he came through Sidon² to the sea of Galilee through the midst of the borders of Decapolis.

Mt. xv. 29

And having departed thence Jesus came by³ the sea of Galilee; and having gone up to the mountain he sat there.

Lk. om.

Mark next relates the healing of "one that was deaf," and the Feeding of the Four Thousand, after which it is said:—

Mk viii. 10

And straightway he entered into the boat with his disciples and came into the parts of Dalmanutha.

Mt. xv. 39

And he...entered into the boat and came into the borders of Magadan.

Lk. om.

¹ See 1 K. xvii. 9 and Lk. iv. 25—6. Commenting on Lk., Origen says that the famine was a famine for the word of God, and that the widow was the same that is called by Isaiah (liv. 1) "deserted," meaning the type of the Gentile Church. Then he adds, "Thou wast a widow in Sarepta of Sidonia, from whose borders there cometh forth the Canaanitish woman and desireth to have her daughter healed, and, on account of [her] faith, earned that which she sought," thus alluding to Mt. xv. 22, parall. to Mk vii. 26.

² "Through Sidon." A.V. has "And again, departing from the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, he came...."

³ "By (παρὰ) the sea."

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

In the next parallels, a journey on water—presumably across the sea of Galilee—is implied by Mark but not by Matthew:—

Mk viii. 13—14 (<i>lit.</i>)	Mt. xvi. 4—5 (<i>lit.</i>)	Lk. om.
And having left them, having again <i>gone on board</i> , he departed <i>to the other side</i> . And they had forgotten to take loaves... ¹ .	And having[finally] left them he departed. And the disciples, having come <i>to the other side</i> , had forgotten to take loaves.	

Then follows, in Mark alone (viii. 22—6) “And they come to *Bethsaida*, and they bring to him a blind man...” Him Jesus “brought out of the village” and healed, and sent away, saying, “Do not even enter into the village.” And now comes the tradition above quoted, where Mark and Matthew say that Jesus came into the neighbourhood of “*Caesarea Philippi*,” but Luke that He was “*praying alone*.”

It will be seen that, if we ask whence Jesus came to Caesarea, Mark answers “from Bethsaida.” And it was to “Bethsaida” (again, according to Mark) that Jesus “constrained the disciples to go” immediately after the miracle of the Five Thousand, although they were in fact carried to “Gennesaret.” Thus it may be said briefly that Mark, in relating the movements of Jesus, makes two mentions of Bethsaida or its neighbourhood, and that Luke omits practically everything that Mark places between these two mentions. The omitted passages include the Walking on the Sea, the Healing of the Syrophoenician woman’s daughter, and the Feeding of the Four Thousand, all of which occur in the north of Palestine. Luke himself mentions

¹ Mk viii. 13—14 καὶ ἀφ’ αὐτῶν πάλιν ἐμβὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν. Καὶ ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους, Mt. xvi. 4 καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἀπῆλθεν. Καὶ ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἰς τὸ πέραν ἐπελάθοντο ἄρτους λαβεῖν.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

a coming to Bethsaida, but it is before, not after, the Feeding of the Five Thousand¹.

The Mark-Matthew passages covering this interval between the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Confession of Peter will be discussed in their order. Meantime it may be noted that, although John gives no details of such journeyings, he tells us, in a general way, that when Jesus had set forth the doctrine of bread in Capernaum, "many of his disciples *went back and walked no more with him*"². Hereupon Jesus said to the Twelve "Will ye also go away?" and Peter protested his unshaken belief in Him as "the Holy One of God." This is consistent with the view that there was an interval—passed over by Luke without any indication and by John with nothing but this brief indication—between the Feeding of the Five Thousand and Peter's protestation, followed by Christ's resolution to go up to Jerusalem. During this interval, although Jesus occasionally attracted multitudes around Him by His power of working wonders, He would seem (according to the Fourth Gospel) to have been gradually deserted by almost all disciples except the Twelve.

Something of this kind Mark seemingly assumes to have happened by the time Jesus reached Caesarea. From the midst of the Pharisees (whom He had "offended" by His doctrine)³, Jesus comes (desiring that no man should know of it) first to Tyre and the Syrophenician woman⁴; then to the sea of Galilee where He heals the deaf man; then to a desert place where He feeds the Four Thousand; then to Dalmanutha where the Pharisees again "tempt" Him⁵; then to Bethsaida

¹ Lk. ix. 10.

² Jn vi. 66.

³ Mk vii. 1 *συνάγονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι*, Mt. xv. 12 (parall. to Mk vii. 17) *οἶδας ὅτι οἱ Φαρισαῖοι . . . ἐσκανδαλίσθησαν*;

⁴ Mk vii. 24 "He desired that none should know" indicates that few of His disciples accompanied Him. There is a similar avoidance of publicity in Mk vii. 33—6.

⁵ Mk viii. 10—11.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

where the blind man is taken out of the village and not allowed to re-enter it¹, and lastly to Caesarea Philippi². Here, according to Luke, "as he was praying alone, the disciples were with him, and he asked them saying, Who do the multitudes say that I am³?" Not one of them could reply "The multitudes confess thee to be the Christ." That confession was reserved for Peter when Jesus appealed from the multitudes to the disciples themselves: "But who say ye that I am? Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ⁴."

Among many notable sayings in this Marcan section the most important perhaps for us, in our attempt to explain Luke's deviation from Mark, is the saying "There is nothing from without the man that going into him can defile the man," or rather, to render the Greek literally, "*make the man common*⁵." These words are not easy to reconcile with Peter's apparent ignorance of the doctrine in the Acts, where the Apostle refuses to eat of certain food until he hears a voice from heaven saying "What God hath cleansed *make not thou common*⁶."

Perhaps Luke's knowledge of Peter's vision, as being required to remove his ignorance, was one of several causes that induced him to omit the Marcan section containing this exposition of Christ's doctrine of non-defilement. But we shall have to note, in its order, that Mark (but not the parallel Matthew) calls this saying "*a parable*⁷." Now John represents

¹ Mk viii. 22—6.

² Mk viii. 27.

³ Lk. ix. 18. Luke does not mention Caesarea. Instead of οἱ ὄχλοι, Mk viii. 27, Mt. xvi. 13 have οἱ ἄνθρωποι, i.e. "men in general, as distinct from you."

⁴ Mk viii. 29 "the Christ," Mt. xvi. 16 "the Christ, the Son of the living God," Lk. ix. 20 "the Christ of God."

⁵ Mk vii. 15, Mt. xv. 11 both use κοινῶν, lit. "make common." The word is quite different from that in Jn xviii. 28 "that they might not be defiled (ἵνα μὴ μανθῶσιν)." Κοινῶν will be discussed in its place.

⁶ Acts x. 15.

⁷ Mk vii. 17 "...his disciples asked of him the parable," parall.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

Jesus as telling the disciples that all His utterances were of the nature of proverbs, parables, or dark sayings, and would remain so until the Holy Spirit came to illuminate them. It is a reasonable hypothesis that this sweeping utterance of Jesus (about non-defilement) by which the Pharisees were alienated and Christ's own disciples astonished, was one of a number of such dark sayings. They reached out so far into the future that they might well seem to Luke to be erroneous anachronisms. But in fact they may have been the genuine utterances of Jesus cast into the minds of His disciples like seeds that needed time (and perhaps tribulation) before they could spring up and grow and bear fruit. This hypothesis is at all events so far probable as to make it worth while to include in our study of the Fourfold Gospel this Mark-Matthew narrative of journeyings in northern Palestine though Luke omits them all.

§ 3. "*Having (?) bidden them farewell,*" in Mark¹

Mark and Matthew agree, with very slight differences, in saying that Jesus constrained the disciples to go on board and precede Him, with a view to returning across the water, while He was dismissing, or until He should have dismissed, the multitude². Mark however has "*to Bethsaida*" as well as "*unto the other side.*" Now Bethsaida could not be said to be "*on the other side.*" According to Luke, it was close to the scene of the miracle³. In any case, it was on the North-East side of the Lake—not on the West with Gennesaret and Capernaum,

Mt. xv. 12 "...the disciples said unto him, Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended when they heard this saying?"

¹ Mk vi. 46 καὶ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς, Mt. xiv. 23 καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους.

² Mk vi. 45 καὶ εὐθὺς ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προαγεῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαιδάν, ὥς αὐτὸς ἀπολύει τὸν ὄχλον, Mt. xiv. 22 καὶ [εὐθέως] ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβῆναι εἰς [marg. + τὸ] πλοῖον καὶ προαγεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν, ὥς οὐ ἀπολύσῃ τοὺς ὄχλους.

³ Lk. ix. 10.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

to which the disciples actually came¹. Mark may perhaps be explained as meaning that the disciples were to row first of all to Bethsaida, where Jesus would meet them and come on board with a view to returning to Capernaum. At Bethsaida they might wait till He had disengaged Himself from the multitudes who flocked round Him². A similar meaning—though with “*until*” instead of “*while*,” and without “Bethsaida”—may be extracted from Matthew; the disciples were “to go on board and precede Jesus [with a view to crossing] to the other side [waiting] *until* Jesus had dismissed the multitudes.”

So far, the statement of Mark as to the “preceding” of the disciples, and its correction by Matthew (to whom “Bethsaida” may well have seemed obscure and, in any case, superfluous) present no very great difficulty. And the statement, made by both, that Jesus “*constrained*” the disciples to precede Him may also be reasonably explained. John says that the multitude purposed to snatch Jesus away and to make Him “king.” To leave their Master at nightfall in a lonely place and in the midst of an excited multitude who thus claimed Him as their own, may well have been distasteful to some of the Twelve. Others, including Judas Iscariot, may have sympathized too much with the excitement, and may have desired Jesus to take advantage of it. Jesus said to them not long afterwards “One of you is a devil.” He referred to Judas Iscariot. But others of the disciples may have needed to be delivered from the temptation to join the multitudes in putting pressure upon Him to become a king of this world. If so, for their own sakes, they might need to be “constrained” to depart from Him for a season.

¹ Mk vi. 53, Mt. xiv. 34 “Gennesaret,” Jn vi. 17 “Capernaum.”

² Cramer (on Mk vi. 45) has “Having therefore dismissed (*ἀπολύσας*) the multitudes (*ὄχλους*)—because men kept coming to Him, some of them probably to receive His blessing, and others for some kind of service (*τῶν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ θεραπείᾳ τινι*) . . .” *Ἀπολύσας* and *ὄχλους* are the forms used in Mt. not in Mk. *Θεραπεία* might mean (1) homage to Jesus, (2) medical service from Jesus (comp. Lk. ix. 11).

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

But this explanation of "constraint" does not include an explanation of Mark's next words, which are ambiguous, "Having bidden them farewell." Does "*them*" mean "the disciples," or "the multitude" just mentioned ("while he was dismissing the multitude")? If it means "the multitude," why does not Mark repeat "*dismiss*" ("*having dismissed them*") as Matthew does? It is not like Mark to vary words, introducing a new and rare word "bid farewell" for the sake of mere variety without any difference of meaning. On the other hand, if "*them*" means "the disciples," the mention of "farewell" here seems to come too late, since Jesus has already "constrained" them to enter the boat and to precede Him across the sea.

Examining the versions of Mark, we find that A.V., Vulgate, and Syriac render the two Greek words "*dismiss*" and "*bid farewell*" by one and the same word¹. But two of the principal Latin codices render the latter "*depart from*". This affords an additional reason for investigating the meaning of the latter (which it will be convenient to transliterate as *apotassomai*) and its applicability here. If it could mean that Jesus, though He at first proposed to "*send away*" the multitude as usual, found it necessary to disengage Himself from them with unusual abruptness, that would meet the objection above stated. It would shew that Mark changed his words because Jesus changed His procedure.

Apotassomai is used by Philo, Josephus, Epictetus, and by Luke in his Gospel and in the Acts, to mean "*bid farewell*," literally and metaphorically². But earlier than these is a

¹ "Dismiss" ἀπολύω, "bid farewell" ἀποτάσσομαι.

² Mk vi. 46 ἀποτάσσομαι, ὁ "proficiscor," *Brix.* "discedo," as distinct from ib. 45 ἀπολύω, "dimitto." A.V. has "send away" twice, R.V. "send away" and "take leave."

³ Ἀποτάσσομαι, in Philo ii. 593 "Lest thine own Agrippa bid farewell to life," a letter from Agrippa to the Emperor, conveys a gentle threat to commit suicide. Josephus *Ant.* viii. 13. 7 says that Elisha

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

passage where Paul says to the Corinthians that, at Troas, although "a door was opened" unto him "in the Lord," he could not stay there: "I had no relief for my spirit because I found not Titus my brother, but *bidding them farewell* I went forth into Macedonia¹." Here an ancient Scholiast says "'*Bidding them farewell*' does not mean 'he *chose* not to preach the Gospel.' Far from it. It means that he could not stay as long as they wished."

A reason can be found for this apparently superfluous warning against "*chose*" in the fact that *apotassomai* had come to mean during the second century, among Christian writers, "*bid deliberate farewell*" in the sense of *discarding an old Master while choosing a new one*. Antithetically, the Christian was said to "bid farewell to," or "renounce," "the Angel of Wickedness," or "the things in the world," or "life," or "the wisdom of the Greeks," in order to devote himself to the service of God². Paul, of course, had no such meaning when he described in passionate language how he left the Church at Troas against his own desire and theirs, under stress of a call not to be refused³. But the antithetical meaning of "renounce,"

begged to be allowed to "salute (*ἀσπάζεσθαι*)" his parents before following Elijah, and that he accordingly "*bade them [final] farewell* (*ἀποταξάμενος*)," and was with Elijah as long as the latter lived. Epictetus *Ench.* xxxiii. 6, (Stobaeus) says "As for dining out in private houses, for the most part *give it up* (*τὸ πρὸς ἀποτάξαι*) (but *τὸ διακρούου* 'thrust it away')." In Joseph. *Ant.* xi. 8. 6 (345) *ἀπεράφητο* describes a ruler "dismissing" petitioners with the answer that he will look into the matter. In Acts xviii. 18, 21 it seems to imply an affectionate farewell for a long period, though with hope of return.

¹ 2 Cor. ii. 13, on which see Cramer.

² *Hermas Mand.* vi. 2. 9, Justin Martyr *Apol.* § 49, *Tryph.* § 119, Tatian § 1. In Ign. *Philad.* 11 *ἀποταξάμενος τῷ βίῳ* is taken by Lightf. metaphorically, but it is perhaps literal hyperbole, the meaning being "he has [virtually] renounced life [by perilling it for my sake]." It occurs in 2 Clem. Rom. vi. 4 and 5, and xvi. 2.

³ In Acts xviii. 18 "take leave" is a poor rendering (instead of "bid farewell") in view of Paul's long and intimate relations with

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

or "not choose," had become so common in the second and third centuries that the Scholiast above quoted thought it necessary to explain that Paul *did not* use the word to mean "renounce¹."

Returning to the Marcan *apotassomai*, we have to ask whether John *did* take the word in this sense—or at least a sense approximating to it. The supposition that he did is favoured by the fact that he represents Jesus as "withdrawing" from the multitude and that two Latin codices render *apotassomai* by "depart²." Such a departure might be regarded as a kind of "renunciation." Jesus had fed the multitude and had offered them the bread of heaven. They rewarded Him by acting as the agents of "the ruler of this world," purposing to "snatch him away" that they might make Him one of the

the Church of Corinth; and so it is in *ib.* 21, where he adds, to the Ephesians, "I will return to you if God will." An affectionate farewell is implied in Lk. ix. 61 "to those in my household," and a disruption of old ties in Lk. xiv. 33 "bid farewell to, or give up, all his [old] belongings (*πᾶσι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὑπάρχουσιν*)."

Phrynichus (under *ἀποτάσσομαι*) says "'I bid you farewell' (*ἀποτάσσομαί σοι*) is quite outlandish (*ἑκφυλον*). For one ought to say 'I salute you.' For this is what we find the ancients saying whenever they are parting from one another (*ἑπειδὴν ἀπαλλάττονται ἀλλήλων*).'' Probably he intends to censure the indiscriminate use of the phrase in the first person, and on slight occasions, not its use in narrative and on special occasions.

¹ On Mk vi. 45 Cramer prints a scholium not explaining *ἀποταξάμενος* but contrasting the dismissal or "letting go," applied to the multitudes, with the "constraining" applied to the disciples:—'Ἐπὶ (read *ἐπεὶ*) τὸ πρότερον ἀπολύσαι (read *ἀπέλυσεν*) τὰ πλῆθη ἠνάγκασεν δὲ αὐτοὺς—οὐκ ἀνεχομένους ἀποστῆναι ῥαδίως (τοῦτο μὲν διὰ τὴν διάθεσιν, τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἀπορούντας ὅπως ἂν ἔλθοι πρὸς αὐτοὺς, οὐκ εἰδότες ὅτι...)—ἀπολύσας οὖν τοὺς ὄχλους... ἀνῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος.... The sentence is broken by parentheses, so that *ἐπεὶ*... *ἀπέλυσεν* is taken up by *ἀπολύσας* with resumptive *οὖν*. Then we have an antithesis between the "crowds (*πλῆθη*)" and "them," i.e. the disciples. The former were "dismissed," the latter needed to be "constrained," partly because of their "[personal] disposition (*διάθεσιν*)" toward Jesus, and partly because they were at a loss to see how He could come to them.

² Mk vi. 46, *b* "profectus ab eis," *Brix*. "cum discessisset ab eis."

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

kings of the earth, after their type of kingship, which Jesus would have described as a worship of Satan. "Turning away from," or "renouncing," the agents of Satan, Jesus "went up into the mountain," into the presence of God. It is conceivable that John discerned an antithesis of this kind in Mark's words or at all events in one of the interpretations of them, suggested, but not adequately represented, by Matthew.

Why does John say nothing about the "constraint" put on the disciples by Jesus to leave Him? It is possible that John regarded the "constraint" as proceeding from the multitude to Jesus: "*They were [for] constraining Him to go before them,*" that is, to become their leader or king¹. If that is so, John does not omit, but re-interprets the Marcan "constraint." Mark may have been right as to the "constraint," which seems to fit all the circumstances. John may have been right about the desire to compel Jesus to become a "king," but wrong in supporting it from a tradition that mentioned "constraint" in an altogether different context. Mark and John, together, help us to approximate to what was probably the historical fact.

§ 4. "*Distressed*" and "*the fourth watch of the night,*" in *Mark and Matthew*²

These words are omitted by John, who, instead of mentioning the time at which Jesus came to the disciples, mentions the distance over which the disciples had rowed: "When therefore they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs³." Macarius has preserved an ancient attack on

¹ See Gesen. 817 b.

² Mk vi. 48 (Mk inserts "about" before "the fourth watch," Mt. does not), Mt. xiv. 24—5. see p. 403. It will be convenient to discuss "distressed," applied by Mark to the disciples but by Matthew to the boat, in the next section.

³ Jn vi. 19. The parall. Mt. xiv. 24 (W.H. txt) "many furlongs from the shore" should be contrasted with this more definite statement. Mt. xiv. 24 (R.V. txt) "in the midst of the sea" seems likely to be a corrupt assimilation to Mk vi. 47. Codex D has, in Mk, *ἡ*

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

the Marcan phrase by a hostile critic, who says that the Lake is so narrow that even a canoe can cross it in two hours¹, and that the Lake is too small to have room for waves and tempests. Although this last statement is quite untrue, the critic hits a weak point in Mark, who tells us that "when even was come"—that is to say, roughly, during the first watch of the night, which lasted from 6 to 9 P.M.—"the boat was in the midst of the sea," and that Jesus did not come till "about the fourth watch," which lasted from 3 to 6 A.M. It is hardly credible that two watches of the night, or six hours, were spent in rowing on a small lake, without progress, and yet without drifting somewhere into the shore. We have therefore to ask whether Mark may have been misled by some tradition connecting some trial of the faith of the disciples with "*about the fourth watch of the night*," which he has recorded here, out of place.

The indefiniteness implied by "*about*" indicates that the time might be taken by some as the beginning of the fourth watch, by others as the end². If taken as the beginning, it would practically synchronize with the end of the third watch. Now the third watch is, by implication, called "cockcrowing" in Mark, later on, "Watch therefore; for ye know not when the

πάλαι τὸ πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῇ θαλάσῃ—which seems an attempt to meet objections as to time and space by suggesting that the vessel, having "long ago" reached the middle of the Lake, could make no further headway owing to the opposing wind. D, in Mt., has ἦν εἰς μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης.

¹ Macar. iii. 6 (ed. Blondel, p. 60).

² See Macar. iii. 13, p. 84: Τετάρτῃ δὲ οὐκ ἀπὸ τέλους φυλακῇ τῆς νυκτὸς αὐτοῖς ἐνεφάνισεν, ἀλλ' ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, τουτίστιν ἔρα τετάρτῃ τῆς νυκτὸς. Ἐὰν δέ, ὥς σὺ φῆς, βιασθῶμεν εἰπεῖν τὴν ἀπὸ τέλους. . . . The Apologist appears to misrepresent his critic, who implies the same time in his phrase (*ib.* iii. 6, p. 60) "tenth hour of the night" that the Apologist implies in his phrase "fourth hour of the night" (namely 3 A.M., reckoned, severally, from average sunset or from midnight). But the discussion, though confused, is instructive, as shewing that a night-watch might be reckoned from its beginning or from its end.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

lord of the house cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at *cockcrow*ing, or in the morning¹." It is probable that this tradition of Mark—not followed by the parallel Matthew, and altered by the parallel Luke—is very early, and that it contains a reference to Peter's denial, which took place *about the time of "cockcrow*ing," after he and the rest had received the warning "Watch and pray lest ye enter into temptation." This is all the more probable because the word *alektorophōnia*, "cockcrowing," is not alleged to have existed in the Greek language before this Marcan use of it. It would seem to be a Greek rendering of the Latin *gallicinium*, which passed into Mark's Gospel from Peter's indelible recollection of Christ's prediction "before the cock crow."

According to this view, "about the fourth watch of the night" in Mark's account of the Walking on the Sea must not be taken literally. There may have been, literally, some storm on the sea of Tiberias where Jesus appeared to the disciples as their Saviour guiding them to safety. But, if there was, we are not to assume that the details are here literally and exactly described as to time and place. The time described as "about the fourth watch" is to be regarded as "the hour of trial," corresponding to the "cockcrowing" in the darkness of the early morning before the Crucifixion when Peter denied his Master.

¹ Mk xiii. 35. Mark assumes that "even" is 6—9 P.M. (1st watch), "midnight" 9—12 P.M. (2nd watch), "cockcrowing" 12—3 A.M. (3rd watch), "morning" 3—6 A.M. (4th watch). Comp. Lk. xii. 38 "And if he shall come in the second watch, and if in the third," *sim.* SS (and *Brix.*); but Curet. has "If in the first watch he come...happy is it for them...or if in the second watch or the third he come,..." D has "and if he shall come in the evening watch...and if in the second and the third" (and *sim.* *Corb.* and *ε*; *b* has simply "the evening watch"). No particular "watch" is mentioned in Mt. xxiv. 43 "if the master of the house had known in what watch the thief was coming."

Mark does not say that this warning was addressed specially to Peter, but the parallel Luke suggests it (xii. 41) "And Peter said Lord speakest thou this parable to us or also to all?"

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

In Mark, it is true, there is no special mention here of Peter connected with "the fourth watch." But there is in the parallel Matthew. Matthew inserts an attempt of the Apostle to walk on the waters, and relates how he began to sink and the Lord took hold of him and said "O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt¹?" It is incredible that Mark knew of this miracle, as occurring at this point, and yet omitted it. But we can understand how this phrase, "about the fourth watch of the night," the period that followed "cockcrowing," connected with the coming of the Lord in some trial or temptation of the faith of Peter and his companions, may have induced an early Evangelist—Matthew, or some authority followed by him—to place at this point a tradition about Peter's temptation, and fall, and restoration.

This leads us to ask whether the word "distressed," in the preceding context, might have originally referred to some temptation, or trial of faith, endured by all the disciples, but most notably by Peter.

§ 5. "*Distressed*," differently applied in Mark and Matthew²

The word rendered by R.V. "distressed" is applied by Mark to the disciples, but by Matthew to the boat. The Greek Thesaurus gives no instance of the application of the word to an inanimate object of this kind, and we may safely infer that Matthew transferred it from the disciples in the boat to the boat itself because, when applied to persons, the Greek verb *basanizein* often implied "torment" or "torture," and he thought it desirable to avoid such a suggestion.

But in fact *basanizein*, though sometimes loosely used to mean tormenting for the mere purpose of causing pain—and

¹ Mt. xiv. 31.

² Mk vi. 48 ἰδὼν αὐτοὺς βασανιζομένους ἐν τῷ εὐαγγέλιῳ, Mt. xiv. 24 τὸ δὲ πλοῖον...ἀπέειχεν βασανιζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

in that sense loosely applied by Matthew to the torture of disease¹—meant etymologically “test, or try, as one tests gold with a touchstone².” When applied to persons it meant “test” them (and this sometimes by torture) to ascertain whether they were speaking the truth. But this might easily pass into the meaning “test so as to bring out the truth,” “test so as to refine, and purify, and make a man his true self.” Hence Plato speaks of a righteous man stripped of all the rewards of righteousness as being “*tested [as it were by torment] with a view to righteousness*.”³ The first Epistle of Peter, though not using this word for “test,” implies something very much like it when it speaks of “proof” in the words “Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a little while, if need be, ye have been put to grief in manifold temptations, that the *proof* of your faith, [being] more precious than gold that perisheth though it is *proved* by fire, might be found unto praise...⁴.”

A passage in Ben Sira rather favours the view that there was some early tradition, verbally followed by Mark, describing Jesus, personally, as looking down in pity on the disciples as they were “tested” by being tossed in the waves of temptation⁵. It is the only one where *basanízein*, in the LXX, has

¹ Mt. viii. 6 *δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος* an expression not used in the parallel Lk. vii. 2 foll.

² See Steph. *Thes.*

³ Plato *Polit.* 361 c *βεβασανισμένος εἰς δικαιοσύνην*.

⁴ 1 Pet. i. 6—7 *ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὀλίγον ἄρτι εἰ δέον λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, ἵνα τὸ ῥηκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου εὗρεθῇ εἰς ἔπαινον...* The words *δοκίμιον* and *δοκιμαζομένου*, R.V. “*proof...proved*,” Hort “*test (v. l. approvedness)...tried (purified)*,” suggest aspects of *basanízein*, though the Epistle does not mention the word itself. Comp. *ib.* iv. 12 *τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν γινομένη*. The two tests of fire and water are mentioned in Ps. lxvi. 10, 12 “thou hast tried us as silver is tried,” “we went through fire and through water.”

⁵ Comp. Ps. lxxxviii. 7 (and sim. xlii. 7) “thou hast afflicted me with all *thy waves*,” and Chrys. on Mt. xiv. 23—4 “He suffers them

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

a Hebrew equivalent. It says that Wisdom "goes in a strange form at first and will bring fear and fright upon him [*i.e.* on the pupil whom she is training] and will *test him* [*by torment*] in her training until he has [*firm*] faith in his soul [*i.e.* truly, in his heart, and not in mere *profession*]¹." Such a tradition would not exclude—indeed it would rather favour—the supposition that the "test," or "trial," was caused by some impurity, or imperfection, which needed to be refined away². Hermas, whose resemblance to Mark we have had frequent occasion to note, is almost the only early Christian writer that uses and repeatedly uses the verb "test" or "torment," and describes the tormenting as being used sometimes to produce amendment and not always to torment for the sake of mere punishment³.

In Hermas, the Angel of Punishment is described as "*driving about*" the sheep that need to be "*tested* [*by torment*]" for their good, in order that they may repent⁴. Here it may be noted that "*drive about*" is a compound of "*drive*," the word

all the night long to be *tossed on the waves* (κλυθωνίζεσθαι), rousing (I take it) their hardened heart." Mark describes Jesus as "seeing" the disciples in their trouble, Matthew does not.

¹ Sir. iv. 17 quoted from the Hebrew in *Son* 3499 (iv) in a note on "Torments." Ἐμπιστεύειν, "have [*firm*] faith," is probably used absolutely here, as in Sir. ii. 13 (v.r.), iv. 16, xix. 4 (see Steph. *Thes.*).

² Comp. Lk. xxii. 31 "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath begged you [*i.e.* thee and thy companions] to sift as wheat, but I have made supplication for thee that thy faith fail not utterly, and do thou, hereafter, when thou hast returned, strengthen thy brethren."

³ Goodspeed gives βαρανίζω as occurring in Hermas about fifteen times, in Ign. only once, in *Polyc. Mart.* twice. In the early Apologists it is used only once, and then (Justin Martyr) in the sense of "scrutinise."

⁴ Hermas *Sim.* vi. 2. 7 "driving about" περιήλανεν. Comp. Clem. Alex. 458 "The same [*i.e.* the Pastor of Hermas] says that repentance is high intelligence. For [a man] repenting of what he did no longer does it or says [it], but *tormenting* (βαρανίζων) his own soul for his past sins he benefits [it]." Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 8 which says that Lot "*tormented* [his] righteous soul" with the unrighteous works of the men of Sodom.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

used by Mark and John, in the Walking on the Sea, to mean "rowing." "Drive" occurs only once elsewhere in the Gospels, where Luke describes the man possessed with the Legion as "driven by the devil into the deserts¹." The word that means in Hebrew "row" (literally "move to and fro") may mean in Aramaic "madman" or "fool"—as in the Targum on the Psalm "Fools because of the way of their transgression... are afflicted... then they cry unto the Lord... and he delivereth them out of their distress²." In Greek, too, "to be driven in one's mind" is said to be "a more graceful phrase" than "to be mad³." The supposition that Mark's "rowing" conceals some obscure reference to mental or spiritual "driving," or at all events something more complex than the literal meaning, is confirmed not only by Matthew's omission of "rowing," but also by the fact that SS in Mark, instead of "tormented *in rowing*," has "tormented *from fear of the waves*⁴."

Origen consistently assumes that what our Versions render "distress" meant really a searching "test," "trial," or "temptation with a view to purification." The multitudes, he says, were not able to endure this test, so Jesus "dismissed" them. But He separated from them the disciples, whom He constrained to enter the boat, that is to say "the conflict of temptations and difficulties into which any one is constrained by the Word,

¹ Lk. viii. 29 ἡλαύνετο. It occurs in N.T. elsewhere only in Jas. iii. 4 τὰ πλοῖα... ὑπὸ ἀνέμων σκληρῶν ἐλαυνόμενα, 2 Pet. ii. 17 ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι. It would be sometimes impossible to tell whether ἐλαύνεσθαι ὑπὸ πνεύματος meant "driven by a wind" or "driven by a spirit," and the same ambiguity would exist in Hebrew.

² Ps. cvii. 17—19 "fools," Heb. דִּבְחִיק, Targ. רִבְח. See Gesen. 1001—2 on רִבַּח "row," "swim," "run to and fro" (n. "scourge"), Dan. xii. 4 "run to and fro," LXX "become quite mad" or "be driven to madness," ἀπομανῶσιν.

³ Steph. *Thes.* iii. 679 quotes Thomas p. 293, ἐλαύνεται τὴν γνώμην καλλίων λέγειν ἢ μαίνεται.

⁴ Mk vi. 48. D has "tormented *and* rowing," d "remigantes et laborantes (i.e. hard pressed)" (and similarly other Latin codices).

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

and goes unwillingly, as it were, when the Saviour wishes to train by exercise the disciples in this boat which is *tested* [and *tormented*] by the waves and the contrary wind¹. Later on, without mentioning Peter as thus "tormented," he prepares the way for it by saying "Then when we see that we are encompassed by many grievous troubles, and when by toil we succeed passably in swimming through them², let us consider that our boat is in the midst of the sea, being at that moment *tormented* by the waves which wish us to make shipwreck of the faith or some one of the virtues³." Lastly he includes Peter in those who are thus "tormented," saying "If any Peter be found among us...having come down from the boat as if coming out of that temptation in which he *was being tested* [and *tormented*]...⁴"

This mention of Peter as being "tormented" for his good suggests the question, How, if in any way, does the Fourth Gospel represent Peter as being thus "tormented"? Want of space compels us to pass over many differences between the Synoptists and John at this point, as, for example, the reception of Jesus into the boat related by the former but omitted by the latter⁵. But what Origen says about "swimming through"

¹ Origen on Mt. xiv. 22 foll. (*Comm. Matth.* xi. 5, Lomm. iii. p. 77 foll.). He calls it (*ib.* p. 79) "the boat of temptations," and speaks of the disciples as (*ib.* p. 80) "having come into the midst of the sea and of the waves [that are] in temptations" and of (*ib.* p. 81) "enduring the *test* [and *torments*] from the waves until they become worthy of the divine assistance."

² Origen (Lomm. iii. p. 81) "swimming through," διασώμεθα, see *Proclam.* Index "swim." Comp. Plutarch *Mor.* 1063 B "Those who are progressing (προκόπτοντες) are like...swimmers (νηχομένους)."

³ Comp. 1 Tim. i. 19 περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐναγάγησαν. Lk. xxii. 31 συνιάσαι expresses Peter's trial in a different metaphor.

⁴ Origen *Comm. Matth.* xi. 6, Lomm. iii. p. 82.

⁵ Chrysostom, on Mt. xiv. 29—31, has a perplexing comment that is instructive as shewing the difficulties of those who attempted to harmonize the narratives while taking them literally. Quoting Jn vi. 21, he says that Jesus did not go on board the boat till the disciples "were on the point of being near the land (μελλόντων αὐτῶν

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

troubles, and what he calls the "tormenting" of Peter, demands special attention. Related by Matthew in the Walking on the Sea, it recalls to our mind, by contrast, the Johannine account of Peter's swimming to Jesus, connected by John with a miraculous draught of fishes, and placed by him after Christ's resurrection. Luke, who also (alone of the Synoptists) relates a miraculous draught of fishes, places the event long before Christ's resurrection, and connects it with the Call of the Fishermen. And it has been shewn that Luke has probably done this under a misunderstanding, apparently confusing a Greek word that meant "he swam to shore" with another that meant "he made signs¹." Luke appeared to be wrong and John right in the interpretation of the Petrine story. We shall now ask whether there is any indication that Matthew is similarly wrong and John similarly right, in the interpretation of another Petrine story of the same kind.

§ 6. *How Peter "was grieved" by Jesus*²

At first sight it may seem something like bathos to pass from the thought of Peter "tormented" to the thought of Peter "grieved." Spiritually regarded, however, the transition may be climax rather than bathos. The Suffering Servant in Isaiah is "a man of sorrows and acquainted with *grief*," and it pleased God "to put him to *grief*³." Jesus, at Gethsemane, says "My soul is exceedingly *grieved*," and Paul speaks of the

πρὸς τῇ γῇ γίνεσθαι)." And he adds, about Peter, "Having overcome the greater [difficulty] he [Peter] was on the point of being harmed by the less, I mean, by the violence of the wind, not the sea." The Commentary on Jn attributed to Chrys. says "Why did not Jesus ascend the vessel?...He did not go on board the vessel in order that the wonder He was working might be greater." See *Joh. Gr.* 2716—7.

¹ See *Proclamation* pp. 1 foll., 35 foll., 91 foll.

² Jn xxi. 17 "Peter was grieved (ἐλυπήθη) because he [Jesus] said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me?"

³ Is. liii. 3, 10.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

purifying influence of "*grief according to God*¹." When therefore we read in the Fourth Gospel that Peter was "*grieved*" by a question of Jesus, and bear in mind how often in this Gospel very deep thoughts are expressed in very simple language, we ought not to pass over the words without serious thought. Paul says to the Corinthians "For if I [I of all men] *grieve* you, why, who is he that is to gladden me—except the very same person that is *being grieved* by me²?" Much more (we may be sure) might Jesus say the same thing about Peter; He would not, without deep purpose, thus have "*grieved*" the disciple who was hereafter to "*gladden*" His heart.

The scene of this "*grieving*" of Peter is also the scene of what Origen calls the "*tormenting*" of Peter—the sea of Tiberias. The time also may be said to be the same. In Matthew it occurs "*in the fourth watch of the night*"; in John it occurs near the conclusion of that watch, when dawn was coming on³. Both in Matthew and John the night has been spent in toil (differently, yet in both cases fruitlessly). In Matthew, Jesus came over the sea, walking to the vessel containing Peter and his companions; in John, Jesus "*stood on the shore.*" In both, the disciples at first fail to recognise Jesus.

At this point, John's narrative of the fishing diverges into symbolism intended to prepare the way for the "*grieving*" that is to be caused by Jesus to the foremost and most strenuous of His faithful Apostles. There is no "*torment*" of furious winds or waves to shake Peter's faith. He swims—the distance is not great—to his Master on the shore. There they see a

¹ Mk xiv. 34, Mt. xxvi. 38 περιλυπος, 2 Cor. vii. 10 ἡ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη.

² 2 Cor. ii. 2 εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ λυπῶ ὑμᾶς, καὶ τίς ὁ εὐφραίνειν με εἰ μὴ ὁ λυπούμενος ἐξ ἑμοῦ; The advantage of rendering λύπη "*grief*" (and not "*sorrow*") is that the similarity between noun and verb ("*grief*" and "*grieve*") can be briefly expressed.

³ Jn xxi. 4 πρωίας δὲ ἤδη γενομένης, A.V. wrongly, "when the morning was now come," R.V. "when day was now breaking."

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

meal prepared, baked on a fire of coals. This has been shewn above¹ to be a symbol of purifying trial, and sometimes of martyrdom. The swimming and the fire, taken together, suggest a double purification like the one in the Psalms ("we went through *fire and water*²"). But still the purifying process is not complete.

Therefore, although Peter has received, along with the rest of the seven, the *viaticum* that is to prepare him for the work of the Gospel, there comes from Jesus a heart-searching test, torment, or trial in the form of a question that seems to throw doubt on the present genuineness of his love because in a past hour of weakness he had denied his Master. At first he replies meekly. To the question "Lovest thou me more than these?" he will not say *now* that he loves "*more*." He says, simply, "Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee." But the question is thrice repeated. Then, at last, turning on Jesus with a mixture of passionate adoration and something like passionate reproach for thus "tormenting" him, the deeply wounded disciple exclaims against such a question proceeding from one who knows all things: "Lord, *thou knowest all things, thou knowest* that I love thee."

It needs some sympathetic effort on our part to enter into the mind of the Apostle thus enduring a chastening all the more grievous because it was so kind and so quiet. But, the more we think over it, the more clearly shall we perceive that the Evangelist regards it as a final trial of faith, a touchstone or test of the Petrine gold from which the Apostle comes forth recognised by our Lord as being not only a shepherd of His sheep but also a follower of Himself in a special way. He is the only Apostle whose "manner of death" is specially predicted by Jesus as destined to be like His own, so that he might be said to follow his Master literally on the path of the Cross. The very last words of Jesus on earth, as recorded in

¹ See above, pp. 367—9.

² Ps. lxi. 12.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

the Fourth Gospel, contain a precept of special honour and privilege ("Follow thou me") addressed to the disciple whom He had recently "grieved".

§ 7. "For they all saw him," in Mark¹

In attempting to explain why Mark, after saying "when they saw him," adds "for they all saw him," we have to note that Matthew appears to recognise two classes of people in the boat, first "the disciples," and secondly, "the [men] in the boat," that is, the sailors. It is true that Origen, commenting on Matthew's peculiar addition at the end of the narrative, "*but those who were in the boat worshipped him saying, Truly thou art God's Son,*" says "This *the disciples* in the boat say, for I do not think *that others than the disciples said it*." But if Matthew had meant "the disciples," why should he not have said "*the disciples,*" as he has said before²? According to Jerome, Matthew makes the same distinction here—namely,

¹ Comp. Plutarch *Mor.* 452 E where Diogenes condemns Plato for never having "grieved" a single one of his disciples, τοσούτον χρόνον φιλοσοφῶν οὐδένα λελύπηκεν.

² Mk vi. 49—50 "But they, having seen him...thought that it was a phantasm, and cried out loudly, for they all saw him and were troubled," Οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν...ἔδοξαν ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστὶν καὶ ἀνέκραξαν. Πάντες γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶδαν καὶ ἐταράχθησαν, Mt. xiv. 26 "But the disciples, having seen him...were troubled, saying 'It is a phantasm,' and cried out from fear," Οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν...ἐταράχθησαν λέγοντες ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστὶν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἔκραξαν. In Mark, D and the best Latin MSS ("and cried out loudly all [of them] and were troubled") omit γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶδαν, SS has "When they saw him...they supposed it was a devil (Walton, visionem fallacem), and when they all saw him they gave a cry."

To render Mk vi. 49 "but those who saw him," though allowable in literary Greek, would not be in accord with the style of Mark. Bruder (*ed.* 1888, pp. 587—8) gives no other instances of ὁ δὲ with particip. used relatively in Mark except in Mk v. 14, xiii. 13 [xvi. 16].

³ Origen on Mt. xiv. 33 οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, says ὅπερ λέγουσιν οἱ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μαθηταί· οὐ γὰρ ἄλλους τῶν μαθητῶν νομίζω τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι.

⁴ Mt. xiv. 26 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες....

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

between "those who were in the boat," i.e. the sailors, and "the disciples"—that he made before, in the Stilling of the Storm, where he alone mentions "men" at the conclusion of the narrative "But the men marvelled¹." The question is one of more than verbal importance, for it bears on the moral and spiritual value of the confession, in Matthew, "Truly, thou art God's Son." This confession, coming at the conclusion of Matthew's narrative, is in strange contrast with Mark's conclusion "they understood not." Also the contextual mention of the Greek *phantasma*—unique in N.T. and rendered by A.V. "*spirit*" but by R.V. more correctly "*apparition*"—demands careful consideration as being one of many details in this narrative that point to the thought of the risen Saviour, Christ, returning to the disciples across the waters of Sheol, no "phantasm," but reality. It is connected with the distinction between "seeing Jesus" and yet not "knowing" Him, or not "believing" Him to be "the Lord."

§ 8. "*An apparition*," in Mark and Matthew²

Instead of "an apparition," SS has "*a devil*," the Peshitta has "*a false apparition* (or, *vision*)," Delitzsch has "*the appearance of a spirit*." The Greek word here rendered "*apparition*,"

¹ Mt. viii. 27 (parall. to Mk iv. 41 "and they [i.e. the disciples] feared [with] a great fear," Lk. viii. 25 "but they [i.e. the disciples] feared and marvelled"). On this Jerome says "Not the disciples, but the sailors and the rest that were in the ship 'marvelled.' But if anyone contentiously wishes [to maintain] that those who 'marvelled' were disciples, we shall reply that they were rightly called 'the men (*homines*)'—those who knew not as yet the power of the Saviour (*qui necdum noverant potentiam Salvatoris*)."² He says also on Mt. xiv. 33 "*Nautae atque vectores vere Filium Dei confitentur*," that is, "*the sailors and the passengers*."

In Mt. xiv. 33 "*those who were in the boat*" might be intended to mean "the disciples that were in the boat" as distinct from Peter, who had gone out of the boat and was now returning to it with Jesus. But this would not explain Mt. viii. 27 "*the men marvelled*."

² Mk vi. 49, Mt. xiv. 26.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

phantasma, occurs nowhere else in the Gospels except in D's version of a passage in Luke "They thought they saw a *phantasm*," where the text has "*a spirit*¹." Ignatius, apparently referring to Luke, says "For I know and believe that also after the resurrection He was in the flesh; and when He came to Peter and his friends, He said unto them, 'Take, handle me, and see that I am not a *bodiless demon*².'" In LXX and early Christian writers, *phantasma* hardly occurs³; but we may gather from its use in Euripides, Plato, Plutarch, and Pliny (who uses it as a Latin word), that when applied to the appearance of a human form it would mostly mean the "apparition" of one dead, and that it would convey a notion of unreality and sometimes of sinister influence⁴. It would seem that Mark used the word to mean "ghost," probably implying that the disciples, in their panic, thought that their Master had died, and that they beheld a mere "apparition" of Him, perhaps

¹ Lk. xxiv. 37. See Notes 2824* (i) b—e. Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* iv. 43 *ad fin.*, while quoting Christ's words as "*spiritus ossa non habet*," quotes, or paraphrases, the context as "*quum haesitantibus eis ne phantasma esset, immo phantasma credentibus...*"

² Ign. Smyrn. § 3 Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὅτι. καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον· δώματον.

³ In LXX it occurs only in Job xx. 8 (A) (v.r. θαῦμα and φάσμα), Is. xxviii. 7 (A) (v.r. φάσμα), and Wisd. xvii. 15. Goodspeed gives it only in Tatian *Contr. Graec.* § 7 where the context mentions "an army of demons (δαιμόνων στρατόπεδον)."

⁴ See Plutarch *Mor.* 900 F quoting from Chrysippus, Φάντασμα δὲ ἐστὶν ἐφ' ὃ ἐλκόμεθα κατὰ τὸν φανταστικὸν διάκενον ἔλκεσθον· ταῦτα δὲ γίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν μελαγχολόντων καὶ μεμνηόντων, and Plin. *Epist.* vii. 27 (as quoted in Steph. *Thes.* but the text varies) asking a friend whether he thinks that "apparitions" "are really something (*esse aliquid*)," and have "a figure of their own and some kind of divine nature (*propriam figuram numenque aliquod*)," or whether they "receive a vain and variable image [born] from our fear (*inanem et variam ex metu nostro imaginem accipere*)." This shews that "*phantasma*," meaning "ghost," had passed from Greek into Latin early in the second century and probably in the first.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

sent from some evil source, or portending evil, like the apparition of Samuel to Saul.

Luke omits the whole of the Marcan narrative of the Walking on the Sea, including the clause "*they thought* that it was a *phantasm*"; but his use of a similar clause later on (with the same rather rare word for "thought," "*They thought* they beheld a *spirit*, D a *phantasm*¹") favours the inference that he did not really omit this clause, but only transposed it to what he believed to be its right place, namely, after Christ's resurrection. If he did transpose it he might naturally alter "*phantasm*" into "*spirit*" in order to suggest that the word merely meant "a bodiless spirit," without any such suggestion of baneful influence as would often be conveyed by the Greek and Latin word *phantasma* to educated readers. But the evidence of the Lucan context, and the paraphrase of Ignatius, indicate that the original word was not simply "spirit," but some word meaning "demon," or some phrase suggesting unreality or evil origin².

John, in the Walking on the Sea, agrees with Mark and

¹ "Thought," Mk vi. 49 ἰδοῦσαν (non-occurrent in Mk elsewhere except Mk x. 42 οἱ δοκοῦντες ἀρχεῖν), Lk. xxiv. 37 ἰδοῦσιν.

² The fact that Delitzsch renders φάντασμα by "appearance of a spirit" indicates that no single Hebrew word exactly represents the Greek, and favours the view that in Lk. xxiv. 37, as well as in Mk vi. 49, the original was דִּם, "demon," which has been euphemistically translated by Mark. Comp. Megill. 3 a warning a man not to salute "[even] his neighbour (חֲבֵירוֹ)" at night, lest he should prove to be "a demon (דִּם)," sim. Sanhedr. 44 a.

The Mark-Appendix (xvi. 12) says that Jesus was manifested to two of the disciples "in another form (μορφῇ) (Delitzsch, דְּרִשׁוֹ)." Luke says about the two disciples (xxiv. 16) "*their eyes were holden* that they should not recognise (ἐπεγνῶναι) him." Μορφῇ is represented in LXX by five words, but never by Delitzsch's word (which = ὁμοίωμα, or -μοις, twenty-one times). Another word for "form," σχῆμα, occurs in LXX, only in Is. iii. 17 "the secret-parts [of the daughters of Sion]." Luke avoids the difficult questions, What precisely is meant by "form"? And what precisely is implied by "other"?

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

Matthew that the disciples feared and that Jesus said "fear not," but he makes no mention of a *phantasma*. Also he gives us the impression that Jesus may have been walking, not actually on the sea but by the edge of the sea on the shore, drawing the boat toward the shore, so that He does not come to the boat (though the disciples "were willing to receive Him into the boat") but the boat comes to Him¹. If that is his meaning, he seems to regard Jesus as fulfilling the words "He drew me out of many waters²," not by drawing Peter (as Matthew says) out of the waves but by drawing all the disciples across the waves to Himself.

To us, of course, the thought of a *phantasma* and the thought of "drawing" seem to have nothing whatever to do with one another. But we have to consider, not what seems to us, but what would seem to Greeks in the first century. Now Chrysippus uses, and Plutarch quotes, this word "draw," in what may be called a definition of *phantasma*. "*Phantasma* is that to which *we are drawn* in accordance with the absolutely vain and phantastic *drawing*. These are the things that befall the melancholy and the mad³." In the next place, Epictetus, accepting man as the "logical creature," that is, the creature endowed with Logos, Reason (or Word in the Johannine sense), declares "that he is not *drawn* to anything so effectively as to *that which is according to the right logos*⁴." Elsewhere, he implies that the strongest thing in the world of humanity "is Nature, *drawing* [men] toward her will and purpose⁵." He nowhere mentions *phantasma*, but he mentions *phantasy* often, and once

¹ Jn vi. 21. They (*ib.* 19) "see Jesus nearing (*εγγὺς . . . γινόμενον*)" just as sailors "see a coast receding" though the "coast" does not "recede." See *Joh. Gr.* 2348 a (quoting Philo on Gen. iii. 8) and 2716—7 etc.

² 2 S. xxii. 17 *εἰλκυσε*, Ps. xviii. 16 *προσέλαβε*, where the Heb. (in both) is *נשׁב*, the word used (as Rashi remarks) about "drawing out" Moses from the water (Exod. ii. 10).

³ Plutarch *Mor.* 900 F quoted above, p. 431, n. 4.

⁴ Epict. i. 2. 4 *ἔλκω*.

⁵ Epict. ii. 20. 15 *ἔλκω*.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

in a passage where he bids us go and look at Socrates and weigh his example against the temptations of pleasure: "By setting these [thoughts] against [those], you will conquer the *phantasy* and not be *drawn-and-dragged by it*¹." Lastly, John, alone of the Evangelists, not only describes Jesus as the Logos but also represents Him as twice referring to the attractive "*drawing*" of the Father and of the Son: "No man can come unto me except the Father that sent me *draw* him," "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will *draw* all men unto myself²."

With these facts before us, it does not seem improbable that John, in his version of the Walking on the Sea, was influenced by the Stoic doctrine about *phantasma* as being the result of "fear." He does not mention—perhaps he dislikes the very thought of mentioning—a *phantasma*, in connection with Jesus and His disciples, even though the context is to shew that there was no *phantasma*. He prefers to shew us that the fault rested with the disciples, not in anything outside them. The disciples, he says, "beheld" Jesus and yet "feared"! He leaves us to imagine what a *phantasma* they were creating for themselves when they recoiled from their own Saviour. Afterwards he shews us the Saviour drawing them toward Himself.

Later on, in the Johannine narrative of Christ's last appearance to the disciples, though there is no mention either of a "phantasma" or of "drawing," there is a clear recognition of the fact that Jesus, at first, standing on the shore of Tiberias, appeared to be other than Himself, and that, by some means not mentioned, He caused them to "know" that He was "the Lord." Jesus, we are told, "stood on the beach, howbeit the disciples *knew not that it was Jesus*³." The day was breaking so that they could see Him. He spoke to them and they heard and did what He bade them. But not till after something more than mere words had passed, not till after the disciples

¹ Epict. ii. 18. 23, "drawn-and-dragged," *ἑλκύω*.

² Jn vi. 44. xii. 32 *ἑλκύω*. Jn never uses *ἔλκω*.

³ Jn xxi. 4 *οὐ μόντοι ᾔδεισαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστίν*.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

had done something in their Lord's service was it said "It is the Lord," and then by only one of the seven, "the disciple whom Jesus loved." Then, after a brief interval, the narrative passes into abrupt and irregular paradox: "Jesus saith unto them '[Come] hither, break your fast.' Not one of the disciples would dare to examine him [saying] 'Who art thou?'—[all of them] *knowing that it was the Lord*¹."

The commentary of Chrysostom and the paraphrase of Nonnus given below indicate their feeling that the text needs explanation. But Nonnus does not really explain it at all. For he says that "*not even*" Peter ventured to say "Who art thou?" Why should Peter wish to ask it? The beloved disciple had told him it was the Lord, and he had swum to

¹ Jn xxi. 12 λέγει αὐτοῖς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς Δεῦτε ἀριστήσατε. οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα τῶν μαθητῶν ἐξετάσαι αὐτὸν Σὺ τίς εἶ; εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ κύριός ἐστιν. For ἐξετάζω here, comp. Judith viii. 13 "And now ye would fain cross-examine (or, search out) God and ye will know ye nothing to all eternity." The Arab. Diatess. has "for they knew that it was our Lord, but he did not appear to them in his [own] form," SS "Not one of his disciples was daring to ask him who it was because *they were believing that it was he*."

Chrysostom paraphrases thus: "For they knew on the one hand (ᾔδεισαν μὲν γὰρ) that it was the Lord, and for this cause they did not ask (οὐκ ᾔρωτων) Who art thou? But seeing His form *more* (or, somewhat) altered (τὴν δὲ μορφήν ἀλλοιοτέρῳ ὁρῶντες) and full of awe-inspiring majesty (καὶ πολλῆς ἐκπλήξεως γέμουσαν) they were exceedingly amazed, and desired to ask something about it (ἐβούλοντό τι περὶ αὐτῆς ἐρωτᾶν). But the [feeling of] awe (τὸ δέος) and the fact of their knowing that it was no other but Himself, stopped their asking, and they merely went on eating the food that He framed for them with more authority" [than in the Feeding of the Five Thousand].

Nonnus paraphrases with more than his usual freedom. After "the net was not rent"—deferring the invitation "Jesus saith, 'Come and break your fast'"—he proceeds, "Not then with daring did any man of that band of companions, watching with close-fronting eyes God present (ἀντιποῖς βλεφάροις θεὸν παρόντα δοκεῖον) ask 'Who art thou?' And not [even] bold Simon asked [this], recognising near at hand (ἐγγύθι γνώσκων) that it was [the] Lord Jesus." Thus he applies "knowing" to Peter only, and this on the ground of his being "near at hand."

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

Him. Nonnus himself says that Peter was "near at hand" and "recognised" Jesus. Chrysostom comes much nearer to an explanation. The disciples (he says) knew that it was Jesus, but Jesus in an "altered" form; and they wished to ask Him, not really "Who art thou?" but "*something about it,*" i.e. about the alteration.

What was this alteration? This above all things, it would seem, that there were no longer manifest the wounds in His hands which He had shewn them at His first appearance after death, and about which He had said to Thomas "See my hands." On the present occasion, when He gave them the bread and the fish, if the wounds had been still there, they could not have failed to see them. In that case, they could have had no desire to ask Him anything. But apparently the wounds were no longer there. Their absence would seem to be one of the points in which, as Chrysostom says, "His form was more altered and full of awe-inspiring majesty."

Then how did they "know" Him? If the "wounds" were not in the hands and if the "form" generally was altered, whence came their "knowing" that it was the Lord? The difficulty raised by this question seems to have induced the Syro-Sinaitic translator to substitute "*believed*" for "*knew*"; and the substitution, though erroneous, leads us to the right meaning. For "*knew*" means here "*knew in their heart of hearts*"—not by means of visible "proofs¹," such as the wounds in the hands, but by invisible proof, by the sense of the presence of the Lord's Spirit. This kind of "knowledge" might be described by some as no knowledge at all but mere "*belief*." But others would say that this kind of "belief" is more than mere "knowledge." It may be illustrated by what Ignatius says to the Smyrnaeans, "*I know and believe* that also after the Resurrection He existed in the flesh; and when He came to Peter and his companions

¹ Comp. Acts i. 3 *τεκμηρίους* (Thucydidean "proofs") on which see *Introd.* p. 115.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

He said unto them, Take, handle me, and see that I am not a demon without body¹." By this Ignatius apparently means "I know, yes, and I more than know, I have a belief [breathing in me from Christ and testifying to Christ]²."

Perhaps we ought not to conclude our thoughts about the Johannine phrase "*knowing* that it was the Lord" without a word of reference to the Johannine "*seeing*" mentioned in the preceding manifestation, in which Jesus had said to Thomas "Because thou hast *seen* me thou hast believed; blessed are those that have not seen and have believed³." Thomas was now present again. The things that he had "*seen*"—the wounds in the hands and side—were apparently now *not* to be "*seen*." Visibly, it was a different Jesus. Yet it differed in being, so to speak, more truly Jesus than before, a Jesus or Saviour independent of mere external or logical proofs, a Jesus not seen in the same way as in old days, but seen in the heart and received into the soul.

¹ Ign. *Smyrn.* § 3 Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὅσα· καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. On this, Lightf. quotes Jerome as rendering οἶδα, "I know," by "vidi," "I have seen," and as inferring that Ignatius had seen our Lord in the flesh after the Resurrection. It does not seem likely that Jerome would have made this mistake if he had not been led to it by feeling that there is bathos in saying "I know and believe that this is so."

² Comp. Rom. xiv. 14 "I know and am persuaded *in the Lord Jesus* that nothing is unclean of itself (δι' αὐτοῦ)." A.V. has "*by the Lord Jesus*." But "*in*" describes the region, so to speak, in which the persuasion dominates the apostle. In one aspect, it is deep down, in a man's heart of hearts, the region of absolute conviction; in another, it is high up, in the heaven of heavens, the region of absolute reality. The words "*in the Lord Jesus*" make all the difference.

³ Jn xx. 29 καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. *Joh. Gr.* 2499 b.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

§ 9. "But their heart was hardened," in Mark¹

There is nothing, in the parallel Matthew, like this Marcan tradition about the "hardening of the heart," nor like the preceding words, "they were sore amazed in themselves." SS has "And they were wondering among themselves, for they had not perceived from the bread, because their heart was blind." The Arabic Diatessaron, besides resembling SS in meaning, transposes the words to a later position, "And when they came out of the ship to the land they marvelled greatly and were perplexed in themselves, and they had not understood from that bread, because their heart was gross²." If Mark is recording an early and genuine tradition, how can we explain Matthew's conduct in not only omitting it but also substituting a statement that they that were in the boat "worshipped" Jesus? The probable explanation is that the Marcan tradition—although early and genuine, for no one would invent so discouraging a recognition of the failure of Christ's miracle to produce conviction in the minds of His disciples—seemed to Matthew ambiguous and capable of an interpretation less harsh than the obvious one. It might mean "They *had not* [previously] understood...but their heart *had* [up till now] been hardened³." This implied that the state of things was now

¹ Mk vi. 51 *b*, 52 *καὶ λίαν* (Tisch. *λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ*) *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο*, οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη. Here *b*, Brix., SS and *Diatess.* render *συνῆκαν* as pluperfect, so that the meaning might be "had not understood...but their heart had been hardened." Then the question would arise "But did they understand now? And was their heart hardened still?"

On "hardening" or "being made callous," see below, p. 441, n. 1.

² Thus *Diatess.* places Mt. xiv. 33 ("Thou art the Son of God"), Jn vi. 21 *b*, and Mk vi. 54 *a*, before Mk vi. 51 *b*, 52. In combining "marvelled" and "were perplexed" it resembles several MSS, both Greek and Latin. "Gross," comp. Mt. xiii. 15, Is. vi. 10.

³ On the absence of a Heb. pluperfect, and on consequent ambiguities, see *Joh. Gr.* 2480 and *Beginning* p. 210, also above, p. 182, n. 2, quoting *Joh. Gr.* 2480.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

changed. Now they understood and were amazed at Christ's divine power, recognising Him to be more than man. Matthew may be paraphrasing what he regards as Mark's *implied* meaning in a sentence expressing this recognition. This sentence he puts into the mouths of the men in the boat along with a statement of their worship, "They worshipped him saying, Truly thou art God's Son."

It is remarkable that even Origen—who occasionally quotes Mark while commenting on Matthew, and who comments fully on the parallel Matthew here—says not a word about this extraordinary divergence of Mark from Matthew. His silence illustrates the complaint of Victor of Antioch—which the student of the Gospels needs constantly to keep in mind—concerning the neglect from which Mark has suffered. Writing certainly not earlier than the fifth century, Victor complains that he has failed to discover a single commentary on Mark, and says that he has consequently tried to collect scattered observations about his Gospel "that it may not seem the one book that has been overlooked in the whole of the New Testament¹." Quoting this, Professor Swete observes "There was little in St Mark which was not to be found in St Matthew, or St Luke, or in both²."

This is true if "little" means "what takes up little space." But it would not be true if "little" meant "of little importance." And the Marcan tradition before us gives us a glimpse into other reasons for "overlooking" Mark—reasons quite distinct from the *prestige* attaching to Matthew's Gospel and the greater fulness of both Matthew and Luke. There are many passages in Mark where we see him revealed to us as a writer inconveniently prone to insert brief, obscure, abrupt, and sometimes apparently unedifying traditions that require a great deal of explaining. This appears to be one of them.

¹ Cramer i. 263 πως μὴ μόνον ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης βιβλίων δόξη παρωπᾶσθαι.

² See Mark *ed.* Swete p. xxix.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

But these traditions are as a rule of great value, and the present one is no exception. Victor himself apparently explains Mark's "*were hardened*" as meaning "*had been hardened*." He says that the miracle of the Walking on the Sea was intended "for the profit of the disciples." But in order to shew how they were "profited," he finds it convenient to pass into the text of the parallel Matthew: "Having been profited, therefore, they confessed Him to be God's Son, and He did not rebuke them when they said it. Nay, on the contrary¹, He confirmed what they said, by healing with greater authority, and not [merely] as before, those who came to Him."

Turning to the Fourth Gospel for a better explanation of the "hardening," we find that although it does not mention the *word* here, it implies the spiritual *thing*, and it mentions the *word* elsewhere—not indeed as applied to the disciples, but as applied to the Jews at large. Here, it spends nearly forty verses in shewing how completely the Jews misunderstood the doctrine of the living Bread², and how the disciples themselves were in danger of being "offended" by it. This appears to be an explanatory amplification of Mark's obscure tradition "they understood not concerning the loaves." It shews that the misunderstanding was radical, implying a rejection of Christ's true personality and doctrine. Elsewhere John uses the word "*harden*" in summing up the results of Christ's preaching to the Jews, which might popularly be called a failure: "For this cause they could not believe, for that Isaiah said again, 'He hath blinded their eyes and he *hardened their heart*...'; and at the close, he says that this divine "hardening" went hand in hand with human self-love and self-exaltation, "for they loved the glory of men more than the glory of God³."

¹ Cramer, on Mk p. 332, has txt τοῦναντίον μὲν ὁ θεός, but in n., μὲν οὖν (ὁ θεός om.) P. Victor assumes that Mt. xiv. 33 "they that were in the boat" means "the disciples."

² Jn vi. 26—65.

³ Jn xii. 39—43.

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA

In a previous treatise it was pointed out that Mark and John are the only Evangelists that use this word, *pōroun*, *pōrōsis*, "hardening," or "callousness," applied (either as a noun or as a verb) to the "heart¹." It is to be taken here as a key-word. It was applied by Paul, in his Epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians, to describe the "callousness" of Israel (all except the remnant) in rejecting the Gospel which passed to the Gentiles². Mark's original appears to be regarded by John as having a similar meaning, overlooked by Matthew (and not contemplated by Luke who omits the narrative). If so, John's intervention means, in effect, "Note how much is implied in this Marcan word '*hardening*.' It was from this moment that Jesus began to manifest His sense that 'a *hardening* in part had befallen Israel,' so that they could not receive the doctrine of the living Bread."

If we regard "the loaves" as a type of the Eucharist, and the Walking on the Sea as a type of the return of Jesus to the disciples after His resurrection, then we may say that the conclusion of Mark's narrative, with a slight alteration, might have a post-resurrectional meaning: "And Jesus went up [from Sheol] into the midst of the disciples, and the tempest of their souls abated, and they were amazed with a great amazement; for they had not believed that this would come to pass, because they had not understood concerning the bread, that the Lord was to die and give His body to be the food of the Church; but their heart was still hardened when He went up to them on the third day, being raised from the dead³."

¹ See *Proclam.* pp. 362—4. Jn uses only the verb, *pōroun*.

² Rom. xi. 7—25 "The rest of Israel *were made callous*... a *callousness* in part hath befallen Israel," 2 Cor. iii. 14—15 "their minds *were made callous*... a veil lieth upon their heart."

³ Something of the nature of unbelief, but not amounting to "hardness of heart," is tacitly hinted at in Jn xx. 8—9 "Then entered in therefore the other disciple also... and he saw and believed; for as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise from the dead."

CHAPTER X

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

[Mark vi. 53—vii. 23]

§ 1. *Jesus is followed at first by the multitudes*

FROM this point Jesus begins a course of journeying in northern Palestine about which Mark is diffuse while Luke is silent and John rarely intervenes. Space will not allow of the full discussion of these journeys (summarised above) which begin here at Gennesaret and end at Caesarea Philippi. Two details, in a short passage printed below, are discussed as specimens of the way in which Matthew deals with Mark¹.

¹ Mk vi. 53—6 (R.V.)

(53) And when they had crossed over, they came to the land unto Gennesaret, (*or*, and when they had crossed over to the land, they came unto Gennesaret) and moored to the shore.

(54) And when they were come out of the boat, straightway [the people] knew (*ἐπεγινώκτες*) him,

(55) And ran round about that whole region, and began to carry about on their beds those that were sick, where they heard he was.

(56) And wheresoever he entered, into villages, or into cities, or into the country, they laid the sick in the market-places, and besought him that they might touch if it were but the border of his garment: and as many as touched him (*or*, it) were made whole (*ἐσώθησαν*).

Mt. xiv. 34—6 (R.V.)

(34) And when they had crossed over, they came to the land, unto Gennesaret.

(35) And when the men of that place knew (*ἐπεγινώκτες*) him, they sent into all that region round about, and brought unto him all that were sick;

(36) And they besought him that they might only touch the border of his garment: and as many as touched were made whole (*διεσώθησαν*).

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

But the greater part is left undiscussed and is printed merely that the reader may not feel that there is concealed from him a large field where the rule of Johannine Intervention does not hold good.

Matthew omits the Marcan clause "and moored to the shore." Here it seems superfluous, but it would not be so if it were a poetic tradition based on the Psalmist's description of the vessel saved from the storm, "And so he bringeth them unto the haven of their desire¹."

Again, Mark says indefinitely, "when they were come out of the boat (lit.) *they* [i.e. people] knew him." But Matthew supplies a definite subject, "*the men of that place*, knowing him, sent..." This makes all the difference in what follows, for whereas Mark, speaking of people in general, says that they ran about that whole region and began to carry the sick to Jesus "wherever they [from time to time] heard (imperf.) he was," implying that Jesus was moving from place to place, Matthew omits all this and implies that the sick were brought to Jesus who was Himself stationary, "They sent into all that region round about and brought unto him all that were sick." Possibly Matthew was impelled to condensation by the difficulty of supposing the existence of "market-places" that were "in hamlets" (literally "in fields" or "in farms") which has induced many MSS and Versions to alter the text². All this testifies

¹ Ps. cvii. 30. The Heb. נַחֲלָה (R.V. "*haven*") occurs only here. Gesen. 562 *b* renders it "*city*," and notes that the Targum word, which is similar, means "*market-place, province, Syr. small town*." This deserves attention in view of Mk vi. 56 "*villages, cities...market-places*," all of which Matthew omits. The parall. Jn vi. 21 has "*the land* whither they were going." On the return from the Feeding of the Four Thousand the parall. Mk viii. 10, Mt. xv. 39 have severally "*Dalmanutha*" and "*Magadan*," on which see *Corrections* 498 *g, h*. To the instances of corruption there given add 1 Chr. vii. 29 "*Megiddo*," conflated as "*Balad...Mageddi*."

On Mk vi. 53 *προσπρὸς τὴν ἄκρην*, omitted by many good authorities, see above, p. 243, n. 5.

² In Mk vi. 56 many Lat. codd., with D and SS, substitute

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

to the existence of "market-place" as the original word, to which other synonyms were added afterwards.

On this Victor of Antioch has a curious comment, implying that the miracle of the Walking on the Sea had increased men's faith in Jesus. He implies that "a long time" had elapsed since Jesus had set foot in that region, but that "the interval had not only not dissolved their faith but had even made it greater and kept it at its height¹."

The Fourth Evangelist represents the multitude as seeking Jesus immediately after the miracle, but with no worthy object: "Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves and were filled²." That is to say, they did not understand the inner meaning of that which Jesus had said and done; and self-will and worldliness reigned in their hearts leaving no room for the living Bread³. This rejection of Jesus as their spiritual Life and Saviour is compatible with their acceptance of Him as a marvellously successful Healer and with their desire to compel Him to become their king and to lead them against Herod Antipas to avenge the death of John the Baptist.

"streets" for "market-places," a has "in the market-place (*foro*) and in streets."

¹ Cramer *ad loc.* p. 333, Διὰ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἐπέβη... ἀλλ' ὅμως ὁ χρόνος οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐξέλυσε τὴν πίστιν ἀλλὰ καὶ μείζονα εἰργάσατο καὶ ἀκμάζουσιν διετήρησεν.

² Jn vi. 26.

³ Comp. Jn viii. 37 "My word hath no free course (or, no room) (οὐ χωρεῖ) in you."

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

§ 2. *Jesus is attacked by the Pharisees concerning the washing of hands*¹

The diffuse detail in which Mark describes the various purifications practised by the Pharisees helps us to understand

¹ Mk vii. 1—23 (R.V.)

(1) And there are gathered together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, which had come from Jerusalem,

(2) And had seen that some of his disciples ate their bread with defiled (*or*, common), that is, unwashen, hands.

(3) For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently (*or*, up to the elbow, *Gr.* with the fist), eat not, holding the tradition of the elders:

(4) And [when they come] from the marketplace, except they wash themselves (*lit.* baptize themselves; *some anc. auth. read* sprinkle themselves), they eat not: and many other things there be, which they have received to hold, washings (*lit.* baptizings) of cups, and pots, and brassen vessels (*many anc. auth. add* and couches).

(5) And the Pharisees and the scribes ask him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat their bread with defiled (*or*, common) hands?

(6) And he said unto them, Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.

(7) But in vain do they worship me, teaching [as their] doctrines the precepts of men.

(8) Ye leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men.

(9) And he said unto them, Full well do ye reject the com-

Mt. xv. 1—20 (R.V.)

(1) Then there come to Jesus from Jerusalem Pharisees and scribes, saying,

(2) Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? For they wash not their hands when they eat bread.

(7) Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying,

(8) This people honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me.

(9) But in vain do they worship me, teaching [as their] doctrines the precepts of men.

(3) And he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition?

(4) For God said, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, He

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

that during the life of Christ a section of the Pharisees attached to some of these lustrations a sanctity almost like that of daily

Mk vii. 1—23 (R.V.) *contd.*

mandment of God, that ye may keep your tradition.

(10) For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death (*or, surely die*):

(11) But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or his mother, That wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me is Corban, that is to say, Given [to God];

(12) Ye no longer suffer him to do aught for his father or his mother;

(13) Making void the word of God by your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things ye do.

(14) And he called to him the multitude again, and said unto them, Hear me all of you, and understand:

(15) There is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him: but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile the man.

[(16) *Many anc. auth. insert* If any man hath ears to hear, let him hear.]

(17) And when he was entered into the house from the multitude, his disciples asked of him the parable.

Mt. xv. 1—20 (R.V.) *contd.*

that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death (*or, surely die*).

(5) But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, That wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me is given [to God];

(6) He shall not honour his father (*some anc. auth. add* or his mother). And ye have made void the word (*some anc. auth. law*) of God because of your tradition.

(10) And he called to him the multitude, and said unto them, Hear, and understand:

(11) Not that which entereth into the mouth defileth the man; but that which proceedeth out of the mouth, this defileth the man.

(12) Then came the disciples, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended (*lit. caused to stumble*), when they heard this saying?

(13) But he answered and said, Every plant (*lit. planting*) which my heavenly Father planted not, shall be rooted up.

(14) Let them alone: they are blind guides. And if the blind guide the blind, both shall fall into a pit.

(15) And Peter answered and said unto him, Declare unto us the parable.

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

baptism¹. In particular, the importance attached early in the first century to the washing of hands before a meal may be inferred from a Talmudic tradition that it was instituted as a rite by the two famous Rabbis—often opposed to one another—Hillel and Shammai². R. Eleazar Ben Hazar is said to have been excommunicated because he “undervalued the purification of hands,” and when he was dead, by the command of the Sanhedrin, a great stone was laid on his bier³.

Examining Mark's text we find several terms that may be almost called technical. (1) Some of the disciples are said to

Mk vii. 1—23 (R.V.) *contd.*

(18) And he saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also? Perceive ye not, that whatsoever from without goeth into the man, [it] cannot defile him;

(19) Because it goeth not into his heart, but into his belly, and goeth out into the draught? [This he said], making all meats clean.

(20) And he said, That which proceedeth out of the man, that defileth the man.

(21) For from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornications,

(22) Thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness:

(23) All these evil things proceed from within, and defile the man.

Mt. xv. 1—20 (R.V.) *contd.*

(16) And he said, Are ye also even yet without understanding?

(17) Perceive ye not, that whatsoever goeth into the mouth passeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught?

(18) But the things which proceed out of the mouth come forth out of the heart; and they defile the man.

(19) For out of the mouth cometh the evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, railings:

(20) These are the things which defile the man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not the man.

¹ On the *Hemerobaptists*, see Schürer II. ii. 210, Levy iv. 538 a, and Lightf. *Coloss.* p. 402.

² See *Hor. Heb.* on Mt. xv. 2 quoting *J. Sabb.* fol. 3. 4. Others said that Hillel and Shammai merely revived and emphasized the ancient rite.

³ *B. Berach.* 19 a mentioning נטילה, and see Levy iv. 93 b, quoting the same tradition from *Edij.* 5, 6 but with מטהרת. Wetstein on Mt. xv. 2 quotes from *Mischle* ix. 2 a story how R. Akiba in prison refused to refrain from the washing of hands even though he might have died of thirst.

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

eat their bread "with *common hands*, that is, unwashed¹." (2) It is said that the Pharisees do not eat unless they wash their hands *with the fist*, or *diligently*, where R.V. marg. gives as an alternative "*up to the elbow*²." (3) It is said that the Pharisees from the market-place will not eat "unless they *sprinkle themselves* (so W.H.)," but with a various reading "*baptize themselves*³." To discuss this passage adequately would require a treatise. We must select what is of most importance, namely, the adjective "*common*," subsequently taken up as a verb (in Matthew as well as Mark) by Jesus Himself declaring that "there is nothing from without the man that going into him can *make him common*⁴."

The Hebrew word "*common*" is applied in the Bible to food where Ahimelech says to David "There is no *common* bread under mine hand, but there is *holy* bread⁵." It is natural to connect with this the Marcan use of "*common*," as if it meant simply "*unconsecrated*." But the Greek *koinos* has no such

¹ Mk vii. 2 κοινὰς χερσίν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτους.

² Mk vii. 3 ἐὰν μὴ πύγμα ῥίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας, Tisch. πικρὰ for πύγμα.

³ Mk vii. 4 ἐὰν μὴ βάπτισωνται, but W.H. marg. and Tisch. txt have βαπτίσωνται.

⁴ Mk vii. 15, Mt. xv. 11, rep. Mk vii. 20, 23, Mt. xv. 18, 20.

⁵ 1 S. xxi. 4, *lit.* "bread of commonness." The same word occurs in Lev. x. 10 "that ye may put a difference between the *holy* and the (R.V.) *common* (A.V. *unholy*)."
R.V. also has "*common*," where A.V. has "*profane*," in Ezek. xxii. 26, xlv. 23 (comp. Ezek. xlii. 20). The Talmudic treatise *Chullin* meant a "*common*, or *unconsecrated*, food." Comp. *Chag.* ii. 5 (Mishna) "For [the partaking of] *chullin*... the hands must be washed (*lit.* poured upon); for [the partaking of] *holy things* the hands must be immersed." In this sense, "*common*," חָלַל is derived (Gesen. 320) from חָלַל "pollute, defile, profane." It does not however mean "polluted" or "desecrated" but simply "unconsecrated."

Hor. Heb. on Mt. xv. 2 speaks of a "definition of a Pharisee" in the words "The Pharisees eat their *common food* (*chullin*) in cleanness (טהרה)," apparently meaning that they "immerse" where less strict Jews would simply "wash."

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

meaning. *Koinos* occurs but thrice in LXX as representing a Hebrew word, and then only as a paraphrase meaning community of property¹. It may mean "popular"—and possibly "vulgar"—but it never conveys, in non-hebraic Greek, a notion of defilement.

We must therefore seek elsewhere some explanation of the Marcan *koinos*. The most probable is one springing from a use of the word, such as we find in Josephus, applied to the Gentile way of life regarded as the "common" life of the Roman Empire, somewhat as the *koiné dialectos*, or vernacular Greek, was its "common" language. Jews would probably describe apostates from Judaism as turning to "the life of dogs" or "the life of defilement"; but Josephus speaks of them as "revolting from their national customs and preferring the common life²." Elsewhere Josephus describes some as going over from Judaism to the Samaritans because they were accused of "common eating (or, community of eating) or sabbath-breaking, or any other such fault³." This appears to be a polite way of expressing what the Fourth Book of Maccabees repeatedly calls "foul (or, polluted) eating⁴."

In the Marcan passage under consideration, Mark apparently intends to throw on the Pharisees the responsibility of using the word "common" without explanation ("eat their bread with common hands") whereas he himself has previously explained the sense in which he supposes Jews to have used

¹ See Prov. i. 14 LXX "a common purse, one pouch," a conflation for Heb. "one purse," xxi. 9 οἷα κοινῶ, Heb. "domo societatis" (see R.V. marg.) rep. xxv. 24 οἰκίᾳ κοινῇ.

² Joseph. *Ant.* xiii. 1. 1 τῶν Ἰουδαίων τοὺς ἀποστάντας τῆς πατρίου συνηθείας καὶ τὸν κοινὸν βίον προσηρμένους.

³ Joseph. *Ant.* xi. 8. 7 εἰ δέ τις αἰτίαν ἔσχευεν παρὰ τοῖς Ἱεροσολυμίταις κοίνοφαγίας, ἢ τῆς ἐν σαββάτοις παρανομίας, ἢ τινος ἄλλου τοιούτου ἁμαρτήματος.

⁴ 4 Macc. vii. 6 "Thou didst not defile (ἐκοινώνησας, v.g. ἐκοίνωσας) with polluted-eating (μιαροφαγία)..." (of a martyr). *Μιαροφαγία* recurs in 4 Macc. v. 27, vi. 19, xi. 25. *Μιαροφαγίην* also occurs in 4 Macc. v. 3, 19 etc. (about ten times).

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

it ("with *common*, that is, *unwashed*, hands"). But no instance is alleged where "*common*" is thus applied¹. The versions mostly omit or paraphrase it². No doubt Paul says that "nothing is *common* of itself"—meaning "defiled"—except through the mind of him who thinks it to be "*common*."³ But he applies it to that which is eaten, not to the hand of the eater. So also does Peter at first, though afterwards he says that he has learned to apply to human beings what God taught him about food⁴. Moreover, when Peter says "I have never eaten anything *common* or unclean," he clearly uses "*common*" to mean, not "unconsecrated," but what might be called "desecrated," in the sense of being forbidden by the Levitical Law.

It is not surprising that Luke has put all these details aside in the one brief reference that he makes to the Pharisaean habit of "immersing." He tells us that, when Jesus was invited by a Pharisee to breakfast, the host " marvelled that he (lit.) *was not immersed* before the breakfast⁵." Probably "immersed" refers, not to the whole body but to the hands, which a strict Pharisee might "immerse" before a meal instead of merely "washing," i.e. having water poured over them⁶. But even Luke's phrase might give rise to misunderstanding, as though the Pharisee expected Jesus to have immersed His

¹ Wetstein, on Mt. xv. 11 *κοινοί*, quotes Joseph. *Ant.* xi. 8. 7 *κωμφορίας* and says "non autem ista appellatio ex stylo Hellenistico, sed ex re ipsa ortum videtur habuisse." No commentator, as far as I know, gives an instance of "*common*" applied to "hands" by Jews or Greeks.

² In Mk vii. 2 the Syr. versions omit "*common*," *a* has "*im-mundis*," *b* om.; Delitzsch has "with uncleanness of hands."

³ Rom. xiv. 14.

⁴ Acts x. 14, 28. Delitzsch renders *κοινός* in x. 14 *לִנְדָּה*, but in x. 28 *לִנְדָּה*.

⁵ Lk. xi. 38 "*was immersed*," *ἑβαπτίσθη*, SS "*baptized himself*," Lat. codd. "*baptizatus est* (or *esset*)," *e* "*baptisavit*," Tertull. ad loc. "*tinctus esset*."

⁶ See the distinction in the Mishna quoted above, p. 448, n. 5.

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

whole body. In these circumstances we might fairly expect John to intervene in order to teach the spiritual doctrine of washing, and it will be maintained that he does so; but this will be more conveniently discussed after considering the Mark-Matthew account of the reply of Jesus to the Pharisees, and also a Matthew-Luke account of a similar reply.

§ 3. *The reply of Jesus to the Pharisees, in Mark and Matthew*

The reply of Jesus goes far beyond the doctrine of impure hands, and passes into a doctrine of impure food. This is not unnatural, since the charge of the Pharisees mentioned "hands," not in a general way, but in connection with the act of touching food. Jesus first attacks the Pharisees for laying so much stress on the washing of hands, an act not enjoined by the Law, and so little stress on the duty of children to parents, a duty enjoined by the Law but relaxed by some Pharisees if a child could put in a plea of *Corban*¹. In this connection there occurs the only mention of "hypocrites" in Mark's Gospel: "But he said

¹ This charge, as against all Pharisees, is not proved by *Horae Hebraicae*, Wetstein, or Schöttgen, and it is contrary to the spirit of the Talmud. *Nedarim* ix. 1 shews that "the sages" agreed with R. Eliezer, against R. Zadok, that a vow injurious to parents might be retracted. It has been suggested that the real attack of Jesus must have been directed against the Priests (who often derived profit from rash vows). The same suggestion would apply to Mt. xxiii. 16 "whosoever shall swear by the gold of the Temple"—a passage not illustrated from the Talmud by *Horae Hebraicae*, which says "The gold here meant is that which was offered up in the *Corban*." While the Temple was standing, there may have been a section of Pharisees, especially in Jerusalem, who supported the Priests, as R. Zadok did, in such views as Jesus condemned. Luke, writing after the fall of the Temple, would refrain from recording discussions about things that were becoming obsolete.

R. Eliezer (*Aboth* ii. 10—11) was a strong conservative, adhering to tradition, and this confirms the view that the charge brought by Jesus did not include the Pharisees as a whole.

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

unto them, Well did Isaiah prophesy of you *the [great] hypocrites*.... This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching [as divine] teachings commandments of men¹."

This is intelligible. But it is added "And having called the multitude to him again, he said unto them, Hear me all of you and understand. There is nothing from without the man that going into him can *defile* him (lit. *make him common*); but the things that proceed out of the man are those that *defile* (lit. *make common*) the man²." These words may have referred, at the moment, not to food absolutely forbidden by the Law, *e.g.* the flesh of swine, but to food condemned as defiling by Jewish tradition owing to defects in the preparation of it, or in the partaking of it; and this view is confirmed by the context, which does not set aside the Law of Moses but only the traditions of the Elders. Thus we can understand that Jesus might have Himself condemned, at this time, any disciple venturing to eat swine's flesh. Not that it was defiling in itself, but it was forbidden by the Law, and to eat it was also an offence to the national feeling, being sometimes a sign of apostasy. Many Jews had died as martyrs rather than eat it under constraint³. Thus, too, we can understand that there was need of a special vision for Peter, before he could believe

¹ Mk vii. 6—7 where *περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν* is parall. to Mt. xv. 7 *ὑποκριταί... περὶ ὑμῶν*. See *Proclam.* p. 368 (on Christ's application of the term *châneph* to the Pharisees) quoting Bacon's *Essays* xvi. 60 "The great atheists indeed are hypocrites." "[As] teachings" (*Son* 3347 (vi)) appears better interpreted "[as] teachings [of the Law, or of God]" than (R.V.) "[as their] doctrines." But the duplication might possibly imply mere emphasis, "teaching [as solemn] teachings."

² Mk vii. 14 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον. Mt. xv. 10 omits *πάλιν*. There is no previously mentioned "calling" of the multitude in Mark to which "again" could refer.

³ On the attempts to compel Jews to sacrifice, or eat, the flesh of swine see 1 Macc. i. 47, 2 Macc. vi. 18, vii. 1, 4 Macc. v. 2 etc.

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

that even "the creeping things of the earth" might be killed for food by a disciple of Christ¹.

Nevertheless Mark (or the writer followed by Mark) indicates his own belief that, in effect, neither swine's flesh nor any other food could, *in itself*, defile a man, because such meat (Jesus said) "*goeth not into his heart but into his belly*²." It would be the self-will of the eater, or perhaps his fear of torture and love of life, that would "defile the man" by "going into his heart." Accordingly, to the statement of what Jesus said, Mark adds, from himself, the words "[This he said] making all meats clean³." That is to say, this universal and permanent rule ("all food is pure") was to be reasonably inferred from, or was involved in, Christ's utterance.

Stated as it is, without limitation, this utterance might well offend any pious follower of Jesus who had hitherto believed that He had not come "to destroy the Law or the Prophets but to fulfil⁴." A comment recorded by Victor of Antioch recognises the epoch-making character of the utterance: "From this point," it says, "begins the New Law, the [Law] according to the Spirit, the [Law] that no longer seeks [its object] in bodily purifications nor in distinction of foods but in the virtue of the Spirit⁵." The commentator admits that the Law and the Gospel now diverged: "For the [teaching] of the Law looked rather to the outer man, but the [teaching] of the Lord to the inner; since indeed the season was now present when the Cross was destined to put an end to the [dispensation of]

¹ Acts x. 12 "all manner of fourfooted beasts and creeping things of the earth."

² Mk vii. 19.

³ Καθαρίζον πάντα τὰ βρώματα, not in the parall. Mt. xv. 17.

⁴ Mt. v. 17.

⁵ Cramer p. 335, where read (ἡτῶν ἐν σωματικαῖς [for -οῖς] καθάρσεις. Victor (*ib.* p. 263) records the scattered comments of others, not being able to find any ancient continuous commentary on Mark. This commentator is therefore earlier (and from internal evidence probably very much earlier) than Victor himself.

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

bodily things." This frankly admits, not only the novelty of Christ's doctrine, but also its anticipatory nature. It was not to be fulfilled till "the Cross" came to fulfil it¹.

¹ See *Son 3493 j*, "Jesus protests that 'nothing that [*thus*] goeth into the mouth' defileth the man," where "*thus*" means "in the manner and circumstances assumed by the rabbinical traditions." It is added "The implied '*thus*'...might easily be forgotten when the sentence was taken out of its context. Mark appears to have forgotten it."

The fact that the saying is called "a parable" by the disciples and Peter indicates that, even at the time, they did not believe it was to be taken in a literal sense. For this Jerome blames Peter: "Quod aperte dictum fuerat, et patebat auditui, Apostolus Petrus per parabolam dictum putat, et in re manifesta mysticam quaerit intelligentiam. Corripiturque a Domino...." Jerome goes on to draw a moral from this practice of "seeking a mystical meaning in a plain matter." He says that it betokens "a faulty hearer" when a man desires "either to understand dark sayings as if they were clear or clear as if they were dark."

Perhaps Jerome is referring to Origen, who says that here, as in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus again spoke to the multitude in parables (*Comm. Matth. xi. 13 ad fin.*) "But here [also] He [virtually] stretches out His hand to the multitude—calling it to Him and detaching [it] from the verbal acceptance of the questionings that relate to the Law—when He in the first place began to say to them 'Hear ye and understand' (though they did not yet understand what they heard) and in the next place, as [*if speaking*] in parables, began to say to them, 'Not that which entereth into the mouth....'" Origen has previously said (*Comm. Matth. xi. 12, Lomm. iii. 97*) that we learn from the Gospels that the "obvious (*πρόχειρος*)" meaning of the Levitical precepts is not to be regarded as "the scope appointed for the Scripture (*τὸν σκοπὸν εἶναι τῇ γραφῇ*)."

These two ancient interpretations are in direct opposition. According to Origen all the Levitical precepts were of the nature of parables, and Jesus interpreted them in His parable. According to Jerome, Leviticus enjoined plain precepts and Jesus plainly revoked them, so that there was no parable at all. Neither interpretation appears to represent the exact truth.

Chrysostom (on Matthew) sides with Jerome, but is even less respectful to Peter, who, he says, was afraid to say to Jesus "Why hast thou spoken against the Law (*διὰ παράνομον εἶπας*)?" Peter pleaded "obscurity," but "there was no obscurity." He concludes his comment by quoting Mark: "But Mark says that He uttered

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

§ 4. *The doctrine of Jesus on "purifying," in Matthew and Luke*¹

The doctrine of Jesus, as given by Luke, on purifying, or cleansing²—in connection with the metaphor of a vessel—differs from the form of it given by Matthew. Luke mentions the literal giving of "alms," Matthew adheres to metaphor,

these words 'purifying [all] foods.' However, He did not make this clear (οὐ μὴν ἐνίφηκεν), nor did He say 'But to eat such foods defileth not the man (τὸ δὲ βρώματα ταῦτα φαγεῖν οὐ κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον). For they could not yet [read οὐκ for οὐτε] endure to hear that clearly [stated] [or, to hear Him clearly speaking thus] (σαφῶς οὕτως αὐτοῦ ἀκοῦσαι). Wherefore also He added [in Matthew], 'But to eat with unwashen hands doth not defile the man.'" This comment, though (doubtless) wrong in attributing reticence to Jesus, is useful because it shews us how easy it would have been to say "A man may eat anything," if that had been the meaning, and because it leads consequently to the inference "That was *not* the meaning."

¹ Mt. xxiii. 25—6 (R.V.)

(25) Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye cleanse the outside (τὸ ἔξωθεν) of the cup and of the platter, but within (ἑσωθεν) they are full from extortion and excess.

(26) Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first the inside (τὸ ἐντὸς) of the cup and of the platter, that the outside (τὸ ἐξωθεν) thereof may become clean also.

Lk. xi. 39—41 (R.V.)

(39) Now do ye Pharisees cleanse the outside (τὸ ἔξωθεν) of the cup and of the platter; but your inward part (τὸ ἑσωθεν ὑμῶν) is full of extortion and wickedness.

(40) Ye foolish ones, did not he that made the outside (τὸ ἔξωθεν) make the inside (τὸ ἑσωθεν) also?

(41) Howbeit give for alms those things which are within (or, which ye can) (τὰ ἐνὸντα); and behold, all things are clean unto you.

A.V. has, in Mt. xxiii. 26, "Cleanse first that [which is] within the cup and platter," and in Lk. xi. 40—1 "Did not he that made that which is without make that which is within also? But rather give alms of such things as ye have (*marg.* as you are able); and, behold, all things are clean unto you."

² R.V. follows A.V. in rendering καθαρός by "clean" in this tradition; but there is an advantage in rendering it by "pure," so as to connect it with passages where R.V. and A.V. render it by "pure," *e.g.* Mt. v. 8 "blessed are the pure in heart," Tit. i. 15 "to the pure all things are pure" etc.

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

and makes no mention of alms. The Greek text in Matthew is ambiguous since it might denote (1) "the inside [surface], or interior, of a vessel," (2) "the contents of a vessel." Luke seems to oscillate between the two meanings. He also intermixes metaphor ("cup and platter") with non-metaphor ("you"). Hence he writes first "the outside [surface] of the cup and of the platter...but the inside [surface] of you." Then, after repeating an antithesis between "the outside" and "the inside," he proceeds to paraphrase freely. And now he takes "the inside" as meaning "*that which is inside*," i.e. "*the contents*." And, in the same sentence, as if answering the question "How are the '*contents*' to be 'cleansed'?" he replies "By giving the contents as alms" ("*alms*" being, in Jewish thought, often interchangeable with "*righteousness*"). This is equivalent to "Give *the contents* as alms." The next step is to find a corresponding antithetical meaning for "*the outside*." And this forces him, again mixing metaphor, to depart still further from Matthew. For the antithesis to "that which is *within the human vessel*" is "that which is *outside the human vessel*," namely, *the whole external world of outward action* ("all things") as opposed to the internal source of action¹. So he concludes "and behold *all things* are pure to you." The thought is clear enough ("to the pure all things are pure"²). But it departs from Matthew in form. And Matthew seems closer to the original³.

¹ If "the vessel" is taken literally, then "that which is inside" is the food, part of which is given to the poor, and "all things" would seem to mean all kinds of food. But the confusion of the literal and the metaphorical makes it impossible to interpret each detail with confidence.

² Tit. i. 15.

³ It is possible that Luke, on occasions where Matthew's Greek presented difficulties, may have corrected it by recourse to other traditions based on a Semitic original. In this particular original the same word might mean "give alms" and "cleanse." But Luke may have started from the Greek text (see Dalman's *Words* p. 63).

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

We may be quite sure that Jesus did not enjoin, as a means of self-purification, the literal giving of the contents of a vessel in the form of alms *irrespective of motive*. His doctrine would be based on that of the Psalm concerning cleansing, which says "Thou desirest truth in the inward parts...purge me with hyssop...create in me a pure heart, O God¹." And the kind of "alms" that He desired—altogether differing from the alms given by Pharisaean formalists—is implied by Isaiah "If thou draw out thy soul to the hungry." This inculcates, not self-affliction for self-affliction's sake (or for the sake of propitiating God for one's sins), but such affliction as must be felt by the kind-hearted, who will not shrink from sympathizing with sorrow while attempting to relieve it².

That this was the meaning of Luke's word—"contents" or "that which is inside"—is indicated by the rendering of SS "*That which is inside of you give [as] alms, and lo, everything is pure unto you.*" This means "Give from your soul when you give alms." Such "alms" cannot be confused with formal almsgiving. But Luke has been misinterpreted by many, who have rendered "that which is inside" as if it were "*that which is in your power*" or "*as much as you can afford*³." Moreover the question would arise for many early readers of Matthew and Luke "How am I to 'cleanse the inside'? Does not the Psalmist call upon God to cleanse him?" Others, if they were familiar with the language of the Stoics, would know that the precept "*Cleanse the vessel*⁴" was

¹ Ps. li. 6—10.

² *Proclam.* pp. 312—3, quoting and commenting on Is. lviii. 10.

³ The Latin codd. vary; *a* and Corb. render τὰ ἐνὸρτα "quod superest," *b* "quae sunt," *c* om., Brix. "ex his quae habetis" (comp. Tertull. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 27) etc. For ἐνὸρτα particip. = "that which is within," see 2 Clem. Rom. xix. 2 τὴν ἀπιστίαν τὴν ἐνὸρταν ἐν τοῖς στήθεσιν ἡμῶν, Just. Mart. 2 *Apol.* xiii. 5 διὰ τῆς ἐνούσης ἀμφύρου τοῦ λόγου σπορᾶς. These are the only participial instances in Goodspeed.

⁴ See Epictet. *Fragm.* x. (Schw. 179) Schenkl. p. 410 σκέψαι ἐλ κεικάθαραι τὸ ἀγγεῖον (comp. iv. 13. 15 δειξέμεν σου τὸ ἀγγεῖον) where he

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

a common one, meaning, more especially, "Cast away self-conceit from your soul if you want to take knowledge into it." But still they would say "That is only the first step, what must the second be? To cast out self-conceit does not bring knowledge."

These differences between Matthew and Luke, and their metaphorical or verbal difficulties, somewhat obscure the plain doctrine taught in Mark, that what is spiritually impure comes out of a man—not into a man. Also there are warnings in the Pauline Epistles that, in some circumstances, knowledge does not suffice to purify. "Knowledge puffeth up," we are told, "but love buildeth up"; and this is connected with discussions as to what food is to be eaten or not to be eaten¹. Thus, from several quarters, there would come appeals to the Fourth Evangelist to help believers to realise what was Christ's fundamental distinction between things "pure" and "impure" and what were the means by which He instructed His disciples to attain "purity."

§ 5. *Johannine Intervention*

We have seen that Christ's doctrine of purifying the vessel, as set forth in Matthew and Luke, was not only liable to misunderstanding but also, in very early times, actually misunderstood, and that the somewhat similar doctrine in Mark and

says that if one casts instruction into self-conceit (*οἰσιν*) all turns sour. See iii. 14. 8, "Two things are to be cast out from men, self-conceit (*οἰσιν*) and faithlessness (*ἀπιστία*)."

On *ἀγνῶσθαι* meaning the body, as the vessel of the soul, see Steph. *Thes.* i. 233—4. But Plato *Gorgias* pp. 493—4 (comp. Lucret. vi. 17, and Horace *Epist.* i. 2. 54 ("sincerum est nisi vas")) indicates that it was commonly used to mean the soul as the receptacle of thought.

¹ 1 Cor. viii. 1 foll. Comp. Rom. xiv. 15 foll. "If because of meat thy brother is grieved, thou walkest no longer in love... Let us follow after things whereby we may *build up one another*;... all things indeed are pure, howbeit it is evil for that man who *eateth* with offence."

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

Matthew was mainly negative, teaching us that external things do *not*, in themselves, render a man impure. Though, however, Mark did not tell us how to become pure, he mentioned, in his list of the impurities that come "out of the heart of men," one that claims notice here—"an evil eye¹."

We note this, not because of the condensed mixture of metaphor, but because it is perhaps the only Marcan instance of "eye" used in a metaphorical sense. The parallel Matthew does not mention it. Elsewhere, however, Matthew-Luke Tradition has a section about the "eye" as being the source of moral light or moral darkness to man according to its nature². Mark nowhere mentions "the good eye," as opposed to "the evil eye." Matthew and Luke call it "the single, or simple, eye." But the Jews also spoke of a good eye³. A man with "a good eye" looks with good will both on what he gives and on him to whom he gives it; a man with an evil eye looks grudgingly on the gift though he may try to look kindly on the recipient. The former alone has the single, or simple, eye. But this metaphor might not be very clear to Gentiles⁴. Moreover, the Jews used it mainly about bountifulness or niggardliness. Yet, when rightly viewed, this doctrine of a good or evil eye extended to all man's relations with his neighbour. The doctrine of Jesus concerning "the good eye" implied that His disciples were to have a way of looking at things from God's impartial point of view, not a one-sided way varying with *meum* or *tuum*. It was to be "a single eye," God's eye—in so far as God gives it to man, that man may see things to some extent as God sees them—a fountain of spiritual light and life in man's heart.

¹ Mk vii. 22, om. in parall. Mt. xv. 19.

² Mt. vi. 22 foll., Lk. xi. 34.

³ See *Hor. Heb.* on Mt. vi. 22 foll., and comp. Mt. xx. 15 "Is thine eye evil because I am good?"

⁴ Steph. *Thes.* ii. 178 gives frequent instances of βάσκανος ὀφθαλμός, but I have not found one of ἀγαθός ὀφθαλμός.

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

In Hebrew, among many words that mean "fountain," one also means "eye." The metaphor of a fountain of life is to be found in Jeremiah and the Psalms and Proverbs (although not there called "eye"). Jeremiah says "My people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water¹." Such a metaphor answers questions raised above by other less satisfactory metaphors about the purifying of various vessels. It declares that we must *not* be content with purifying any *vessel of our own*, whether called "cup," or "platter," or "dish," or "cistern" (not even though the "cistern" be not "broken"). We must be content with nothing less than the Purifier Himself, who described Himself to Jeremiah as "the fountain of living waters²."

This metaphor of the fountain John accordingly employs, at an early period in his Gospel, not as yet mentioning the word "cleans" or "purify³," but introducing one who assuredly needed to be purified—the woman of Samaria, who had had "five husbands." Sitting beside a "well" or "fountain"—for, in LXX, "fountain" and "well" are often represented by the same word—Jesus teaches the woman the doctrine of "living water" which alone can satisfy thirst. It has been said above that the same Hebrew word *En* (or *Ain*) that means "eye" means also often "fountain⁴." The first mention

¹ In Jer. ii. 13, Ps. xxxvi. 9 "with thee is the fountain of life; in thy light shall we see light," Prov. xiii. 14, xiv. 27, Heb. "fountain" is not the same as Heb. "eye," see below, n. 4.

² See *Proclam.* p. 346 "Philo (i. 575) quotes Jer. ii. 13, as proving that God 'is the most ancient of all fountains,' just before commenting on the story of Hagar at the fountain."

³ John nowhere uses καθαρίζω, but he has καθαρισμός in ii. 6, iii. 25—both times with Ἰουδαίος in the context. Καθαίρω "cleans," in Jn xv. 2, unique in N.T., is perhaps antithetical to (ib.) αἴρω "take away." Origen (on Jerem. xxiv. 6) quotes it after a mention of καθαίρω as if in contrast.

⁴ See Gesen. and Levy on עַיִן and comp. Prov. iv. 21 "from thine eyes (מַעֲיִן)," LXX "thy fountains (αἱ πηγαὶ σου)," probably

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

of *En* in Scripture with the latter meaning is where Hagar, "by a fountain¹," said "Thou art a God of seeing." John seems to draw a parallel between Hagar and the Samaritan woman. Hagar says "Have I...looked after him that seeth me?" (LXX "I have seen face to face one that appeared to me"); and the Samaritan woman is made to "behold" at all events that Jesus is "a prophet²," and through her the Samaritans are led to a knowledge that He is the Saviour of the world. Later on, while inviting everyone that thirsts to come to Him, Jesus says, not only "Let him come unto me and drink," but also "Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water³." That is to say, he shall not only be filled with water but shall also be constantly flowing forth to others—no "cistern," but a "fountain."

We pass now to the first instance in the Fourth Gospel of any doctrine of Jesus about purifying⁴. It occurs in what may

confusing it with (Gesen. 745 b) מַיִם, a form of מַי that also means "spring," "fountain." But in Jer. ii. 13, Ps. xxxvi. 9, Prov. xiii. 14, xiv. 27, מַיִם = מַיִם (see p. 460, n. 1).

¹ Gen. xvi. 7.

² Jn iv. 19 θεωρῶ σε προφήτην εἰς σὺν. According to Onkelos, Hagar says (Gen. xvi. 13) "Thou art Eloah seeing all," and "I also have begun to see after that He hath been revealed to me." The Samaritan woman, who says (Jn iv. 29) "Come, see a man that told me all that [ever] I did," may be regarded as having "begun to see." See *Proclam.* pp. 345—6.

³ Jn vii. 37—8.

⁴ Jn xiii. 10—11, xv. 3. Previously we have been prepared by John to suppose that Jewish "purifications" would play a great part in Jewish life. Note the mention of "the Jews" in Jn ii. 6 "water-pots of stone according to the purification (καθαρισμὸν) of the Jews." Taken with other Johannine mentions of "the Jews," the term, as in Jn ii. 13 ("the Passover of the Jews"), perhaps implies disparagement. Purification is connected with "disputation," or "questioning," and "a Jew," in iii. 25 "a questioning on the part of John's disciples with a Jew about purification." Another word is used in Jn xi. 55 "There was near at hand the Passover of the Jews, and many came up...that they might [ritually] purify (ἀγλῶσαι) themselves"—but still, probably, with a notion of disparagement

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

be called the drama of the Washing of the Feet of the Disciples by Christ. Several details in it suggest that a contrast is intended between this new purification introduced at the Christian meal and the old one practised at the Jewish meal. The old one concerned the hands; this concerned the feet. The old one was before, this one was during, or after, the meal¹. The old one was a self-purifying; the new one was altruistic, a purification of others². Jesus, in this scene, girding Himself with a napkin, appears to be symbolically wiping off on Himself (as Origen says) the sins and infirmities of the disciples³, and saying to us, in effect, that we are to do the same thing for one another. Such a work is not to be achieved except by those who can say with some truth (as Paul said) that they have "the mind of Christ"⁴. But even for those who fail it is well to recognise the difficulty of the task, and to know that it is something very different from the mere attempt to save their own souls. In proportion as we have within us "the mind of Christ," "the good eye," "the fountain of life," we shall be enabled to "wash one another's feet" by kindness, and consideration, and forgiveness of wrong, even at the cost of some self-humiliation or sacrifice. Those who can do this will be purifying the souls of others as well as their own, and will be fulfilling the precept of Christ which He gave us through His Apostle,

(as Origen in his comment indicates). But no doctrine of Jesus on "purifying" is introduced till Jn xiii. 10—11.

¹ Origen *ad loc.* (Lomm. ii. 380) notes that the usual time for washing the feet was before the meal, but that Jesus deliberately "passed beyond that time (*ὑπερβὰς δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον*)."

² Jn xiii. 12—14 "Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me, Master, and Lord... If I then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet."

³ See *Notes 2964* quoting Origen (Lomm. ii. 401) *τάχα δὲ ἵνα τὸν ἐν τοῖς ποσὶ τῶν μαθητῶν ῥύπον ἀναλάβῃ εἰς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα διὰ τοῦ λειψίου... αὐτὸς γὰρ* (Is. liii. 4 and Mt. viii. 17) *τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν φέρει*.

⁴ 1 Cor. ii. 16.

THE NEW LAW OF PURIFICATION

"Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfil the Law of Christ¹."

¹ Gal. vi. 2. Self-purification, when mentioned by John, is expressed by *καθαίρω*. This word means ritual purification. There is irony in the description of the Jews as coming to Jerusalem (xi. 55) "to purify themselves" before "*the Passover of the Jews*." "The true self-purification (*καθαρμός*)," says Origen, "was not before the Passover, but *in the Passover*," that is, when Christ died as the Lamb of God. There seems an allusion to this in 1 Jn iii. 1—3 "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed on us... and everyone that hath this hope [set] on him *purifieth* (*καθαίρει*) himself even as he [i.e. Jesus Christ] is *pure* (*καθός*)," that is to say, Christians are to purify themselves not by self-mortification for the mere purpose of saving their own souls, but by being conformed to the Passover in Christ, fulfilling the Pauline precept "present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God." Before this "self-purification" can be achieved, we must have received a "purification." But that is described by a different word, the Synoptic *καθαίρω* (1 Jn i. 7—9) "If we walk in the light, as he [i.e. God] is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus, his Son, *purifieth* (*καθαίρει*) us from all sin... If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins and to *purify* (*καθαρίσθω*) us from all unrighteousness."

This is a case where John uses in his Epistle a word for which he has prepared the way in his Gospel, not by using the word, but by representing Jesus dramatically as setting before us the word's essential meaning.

CHAPTER XI

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

[Mark vii. 24—ix. 1*]

§ 1. *The Syrophoenician woman*¹

AFTER the Pharisees had been alienated by His protest against their traditions of purification Jesus is said to have

* For comment on Mk viii. 1—9, 14—21, see above, Chapter viii; and for reference to particular passages see p. 208, n. 1, also Textual Index.

¹ Mk vii. 24—30 (R.V.)

(24) And from thence he arose, and went away into the borders of Tyre and Sidon (*some anc. auth. omit* and Sidon). And he entered into a house, and would have no man know it: and he could not be hid.

(25) But straightway a woman, whose little daughter had an unclean spirit, having heard of him, came and fell down at his feet.

(26) Now the woman was a Greek (*or*, Gentile), a Syrophoenician by race. And she besought him that he would cast forth the devil out of her daughter.

(27) And he said unto her, Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs.

Mt. xv. 21—8 (R.V.)

(21) And Jesus went out thence, and withdrew into the parts of Tyre and Sidon.

(22) And behold, a Canaanitish woman came out from those borders, and cried, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil.

(23) But he answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying, Send her away; for she crieth after us.

(24) But he answered and said, I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

(25) But she came and worshipped him, saying, Lord, help me.

(26) And he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs.

(27) But she said, Yea, Lord:

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

withdrawn "to the borders of Tyre [and Sidon]¹." The execution of John the Baptist can hardly have failed to play some part in causing this withdrawal, and in shaping the new utterances of Jesus to His disciples. But there is very little trace of such an effect in Mark's narrative. On the surface, Mark seems to say (as we found Victor asserting above) that Jesus was never more sought after by the multitudes. Looking, however, below the surface, we find indications that the Gospel was not really succeeding. Jesus was making no way—at least on the lines on which He desired to appeal to His countrymen. When Mark, after describing a long round of journeying, brings us at last to Caesarea Philippi, we shall find that, according to the confession of Christ's own disciples, the multitudes did not recognise in Him anything really new. Even among admirers, He was "one of the prophets (*or*, of the old prophets)" or "Elijah." He was not recognised as the Christ, nor as being—in any unique and divine sense—what He called Himself, the Son of Man.

In this drama of rejection, the first scene is devoted to the healing of the daughter of the Syrophoenician woman. After

Mk vii. 24—30 (R.V.) *contd.*

(28) But she answered and saith unto him, Yea, Lord: even the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs.

(29) And he said unto her, For this saying go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter.

(30) And she went away unto her house, and found the child laid upon the bed, and the devil gone out.

¹ Mk vii. 24. Elijah, when he had incurred the enmity of Ahab, retires first to Cherith, and then to (1 K. xvii. 9) "Zarephath which belongeth to Zidon." Jesus, after the execution of John the Baptist, might similarly retire from Galilee, as being under the jurisdiction of Herod Antipas. According to Luke, the Pharisees themselves—perhaps for no kindly reasons—said to Jesus (Lk. xiii. 31) "Herod would fain kill thee."

A. L.

Mt. xv. 21—8 (R.V.) *contd.*

for even the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table.

(28) Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith: be it done unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was healed from that hour.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

being virtually classed among the "dogs," that is to say, unclean animals not worthy to partake of the children's food, and after humbly accepting this bitter appellation, she receives as it were a tacit cancelling of this stigma from Jesus, "Go thy way, the devil is gone out of thy daughter." There are reasons for thinking that the disciples, not Jesus, classed this woman with the "dogs"; but in any case the narrative marks a preparation for the enlargement of the scope of the Gospel, since one of those that had been classed among the "dogs" was now admitted to the privileges of the "children" seated at the Father's table¹.

A comment preserved by Victor of Antioch says that Jesus "called the Jews 'children'...and that, until they had laid their hands on Him, He did not transfer [His] favour to those who are without—naming the Gentiles 'dogs,' *which [appellation] afterwards came round to Israel when it [i.e. Israel] was also deprived of the divine food*." Such language would go far to encourage some Christians in addressing an Israelite as "dog of a Jew." It makes us realise the need of some antidote against misinterpretations of the dialogue under consideration. Some counter-doctrine of Jesus was desirable, shewing His kindness and consideration to such women as this Canaanite.

Such an antidote—whether intended as one or not—is certainly to be found in the Johannine account of Christ's dialogue with the woman of Samaria who had had "five husbands." Assuredly it helps the readers of Mark's dialogue

¹ On the story of the Syrophoenician woman see *Son* 3353 (iv) a foll. To the facts there collected add Exod. vi. 15 "Shaul the son of a Canaanitish woman," LXX ὁ ἐκ τῆς Φοινίκης (οἱ Γ. Χανααῖας). This illustrates the difference between Mk vii. 26 Συροφονικισσα (marg. Σύρα Φοινίκισσα) and Mt. xv. 22 Χανααῖα. The story is commented on, and allegorized at great length, by Origen; but he does not lessen the great difficulty of supposing that Jesus, even indirectly or tentatively, sanctioned the Jewish habit of calling certain Gentiles "dogs."

² Cramer, pp. 337—8.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

to feel that Jesus could not have meant literally that which Mark records Him to have said¹.

§ 2. *The first "sighing" of Jesus, in Mark²*

After the dialogue with the Syrophoenician, Jesus comes through the north of Palestine to the neighbourhood of the sea of Galilee³. Here, according to Matthew, Jesus heals four

¹ The Diatessaron places the Johannine Dialogue (§ 21) after the Marcan Dialogue (§ 20), with nothing between them except Mk vii. 31—7 (the healing of the "stammerer (*μωχλῶλος*)"). Ephrem's comment, making no mention of the healing, passes from the Marcan to the Johannine Dialogue without anything intervening.

² Mk vii. 31—7 (R.V.)

Mt. xv. 29—31 (R.V.)

(31) And again he went out from the borders of Tyre, and came through Sidon unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the borders of Decapolis.

(29) And Jesus departed thence, and came nigh unto the sea of Galilee; and he went up into the mountain, and sat there.

(32) And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech; and they beseech him to lay his hand upon him.

(30) And there came unto him great multitudes, having with them the lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and they cast them down at his feet, and he healed them:

(33) And he took him aside from the multitude privately, and put his fingers into his ears, and he spat, and touched his tongue;

(34) And looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened.

(35) And his ears were opened and the bond of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain.

(36) And he charged them that they should tell no man: but the more he charged them, so much the more a great deal they published it.

(37) And they were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well: he maketh even the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.

(31) Insomuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb speaking, the maimed whole, and the lame walking, and the blind seeing: and they glorified the God of Israel.

³ Mk vii. 31 "From the borders of Tyre he came through Sidon to (*eis*) the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the borders of

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

classes of sufferers, "the lame, blind, dumb, maimed" (besides "many others") so that people see "the dumb speaking, the maimed whole, and the lame walking, and the blind seeing."

"Deafness" is not mentioned by Matthew. But the parallel Mark, which mentions only one sufferer, describes him as "deaf" and (literally) "stuttering¹." Mark tells us at great length that Jesus, after resorting to means not elsewhere

Decapolis." See above, p. 409. This route was very circuitous. Prof. Swete says (*ad loc.*), "the long *détour* may have served the double purpose of defeating the immediate designs of His enemies"—to arrest Him in Galilee—"and providing for the Apostles the rest which He had desired to give them before (Latham, p. 333)." But the variations in Mark's text, and Matthew's curt substitute for it (xv. 29 "came by the sea of Galilee...") shew that it was regarded as difficult at a very early date. If Jesus at this time (comp. Mk vii. 24) "did not wish to be known," it seems unlikely that He would pass "through Sidon," even with only a few disciples (but Prof. Swete says "in so large and busy a place He may easily have escaped notice").

We have therefore to consider the possibility that Mark, though right in the main fact—namely, that Jesus did make a circuit so as to avoid Galilee—may be inexact in detail because he was influenced by O.T. narrative such as that quoted above by Origen (p. 409, n. 1) concerning "*the widow in Sarepta of Sidōnia*." In the same context, Origen quotes Lk. iv. 25—6 (Lomm. v. 211) "There were many widows in the people of Israel, but unto none of them was Elias sent, *save in Sarepta, to a widow woman (nisi in Sareptis ad mulierem viduam)*." Here Origen (or his translator) has omitted "*of Sidōnia*," and it is corrupted into "*of Sidon*" by some authorities (also *e* has *Sidonae*, L *Sidonas*). These two quotations deserve all the more attention because Sidon is not mentioned by *itself* in the whole of N.T.—apart from Acts xxvii. 3 "we touched at Sidon"—anywhere except in two places: (1) Mk vii. 31, immediately after the story of the Canaanite woman, (2) Lk. iv. 25—6 about the widow of Sarepta. Elsewhere in the Gospels "Sidon" occurs only in the phrase "Tyre and Sidon." Mark's original may have referred to "Sidon"—or, more probably, to "Sidōnia"—because the early Evangelist regarded Jesus as following in the path of Elijah. But it is not likely that Jesus as a fact ever "came through Sidon."

¹ Mk vii. 32 "one that was deaf and had an impediment in his speech (*καὶ μωχλῶλον*)."

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

mentioned by the Synoptists to heal this sufferer, looked up to heaven, and sighed, and said, in Aramaic, "Be opened." Then follows the "opening" ("his ears *were opened*") and the "loosing" ("the bond of his tongue *was loosed*"). After this minute description of the healing of a single sufferer, it is strangely spoken of (by the multitude) as a healing of more than one: "He hath done all things well, he maketh both (*or*, even) the deaf (*pl.*) to hear and the speechless (*pl.*) to speak¹."

Of these two accounts Mark's is apparently the earlier and undoubtedly the more suggestive of poetic imagery. Turning to LXX for illustrations of it, we find that his word for "stuttering" occurs nowhere except in Isaiah's description of the return of Israel from captivity: "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped; then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of *the dumb* shall sing," where LXX has "[the] tongue of [*the*] *stutterers* shall be clear-of-speech²." The Hebrew "dumb," rendered here uniquely by LXX "*stutterer*," means etymologically "*bound*³." The

¹ Besides these divergences in the words of Mark and Matthew, there is also a divergence in their interpretations of the same word. Matthew (W.H. txt) uses *κωφός* (i.e. deaf or dumb) to mean dumb ("see the *dumb* speaking"), (but W.H. marg. (substituting "hearing" for "speaking") to mean *deaf*). Mark uses it to mean deaf ("the *deaf* to hear"). As for "*dumb*," Mark represents it by two other words. His first word is "*a stutterer*" ("they bring to him one that was deaf and *a stutterer*"). His second word is "*speechless*" ("he maketh...*the speechless* to speak"). See Mk ix. 17 πνεῦμα ἀλαλον "a speechless spirit," *ib.* 25 τὸ ἀλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα "speechless and deaf spirit," where the parall. Mt. xvii. 15, 18 and Lk. ix. 39, 42 do not define the nature of the "spirit." Lk. ix. 39 κράζει perhaps seemed to Luke inconsistent with dumbness; but in Mk ix. 25—6 κράξας masc. is applied to the πνεῦμα ἀλαλον.

² Is. xxxv. 5—6, LXX ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν... ἄτα κωφῶν... χαλός, τρανὴ δὲ ἴσται γλῶσσα μογιᾶλων, preceded by a mention of (*ib.* 3) "weak hands and... feeble (*or*, tottering) knees." Τρανός, in LXX, occurs elsewhere only in Wisd. vii. 22 πνεῦμα... τρανόν, x. 21 γλώσσας ηἰπίων ἰθὺς τρανάς.

³ Gesen. 47—8. The verb *δῶκε* "bind" = (Tromm.) ἀφέντος (1), 469 (Mark vii. 31—7)

THE 'NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

adjective occurs for the first time where the Lord says to Moses "Who maketh [a man] *dumb*, or deaf...?" where LXX has "*badly-deaf* (meaning *dumb*) and deaf," but Aquila and the rest have "*stuttering*" (for "*dumb*")¹, while a scholiast has a word meaning "*maimed*" or "*lame*." This connection between "*dumb*" and "*maimed*" or "*lame*" may be illustrated by the context in Exodus where Moses says to the Lord "I am (lit.) *heavy* of speech" but the Jerusalem Targums have "I am *lame* of speech," using a word that means in Hebrew "bound [with a girdle]" but in Aramaic "bound [as with a chain round one's feet]" and hence "*lame*."² Matthew, while omitting one of Isaiah's four classes, "the deaf," substitutes a word meaning "*maimed*," but primarily "*bent*," so that it may very well point back to the thought of a sufferer in some way "*bound*" by Satan³.

If we ask why the LXX should have chosen that particular word ("*stutterer*") to express the Hebrew "*dumb*" in Isaiah, we may find some answer in the Targum, which uses a word that in Hebrew approximates to the English "*curbed*" or

κατανύσσω (I), συνέχω (I), δεσμεύω (I), forms of κωφός (4), ἄλαλος γίνομαι (I). The adj. ἄλκ = ἄλαλος (I), δύσκωφος (I), ἐνός i.e. dumb or silly (I), κωφός (I), μογιᾶλος (I).

¹ Exod. iv. 11 δύσκωφον (ἄλκ) καὶ κωφόν (ἔρη), Aq., Sym., Theod. μογιᾶλον, Schol. βωβόν, on which Field quotes Hesych. βωβός· πηρός. βωβούς· χαλούς. Δύσκωφος (L.S.) might be used of one who, never having heard anything, has never been moved to speak.

² Exod. iv. 10 Jer. I ἔρη, Jer. II ἔρη used elsewhere by Onk. to express חסד a "*limper*" Lev. xxi. 18, Deut. xv. 21. See Levy ii. 14 b. Comp. 1 K. xx. 11 "him that *girdeth on* [his armour] (ἔρη)," LXX δ κυρτός "*the humpbacked*," apparently taking it as "*bent forward*," "*bent down*." Comp. Lk. xiii. 11, 16 "*bowed together* (συνκύπτουσα)," and "*Satan had bound*," about the woman whom Jesus (ib. 13) "*made straight*." Also comp. *Acta Pil.* (B) vi. 2 Κυλλὸς ἤμην...εὐθὺς ἡγέρθην with (A) Κυρτὸς ἤμην καὶ ὤρθωσέ με λόγῳ.

³ Mt. xv. 30 κυλλούς, s. preceding note. Justin Martyr (*Tryph.* § 69), after quoting Is. xxxv. 1—7, describes Jesus as healing τοὺς πηροὺς καὶ κωφοὺς [i.e. deaf, as shewn by his comment, τὸν δὲ καὶ ἀκούειν] καὶ χαλούς, but not (Mk) μογιᾶλος, nor (Mt.) κυλλοί.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

"muzzled¹." The Targumist takes it to mean that the children of Israel who have hitherto had their mouths muzzled in their captivity and desolation will now be able to praise God for His salvation². It does not therefore mean exactly "dumb," but rather implies that the mouth is gagged by a "bond," which is now removed. But this word in New Hebrew and Aramaic may also mean "lamed³." Thus we are brought round again from "stuttering," in Mark and LXX, through the Targumistic "muzzled" or "lamed," to something like Matthew's "lame," or "maimed," so as to recognise that "stuttering" and "lame" and "maimed" may be derived from one Semitic original.

Hence we are led to the conclusion that both Mark and Matthew are probably based on Isaiah's description of the Return of the Redeemed. Before the enumeration of the sufferings from which Israel is to be saved, Isaiah says "He [*i.e.* the Lord] will come and save you⁴." Both Mark and Matthew regard Jesus as thus "coming" to "save." But while Matthew emphasizes the variety of the evils from which He saves, Mark emphasizes the radical evil implied by the "loosing" of a "bond" or "chain"—the binding by Satan when he takes men captive and binds them with the chain of their sins and infirmities. Mark also mentions a command "Be thou opened." This suggests the thought of a prison-house, a place of imprisonment with hard labour, over which Satan is task-master⁵.

¹ Ps. xxxii. 9 בלם, Gesen. 117 *b*.

² "*Laudabit lingua eorum quae erat quasi muta (בלים).*" Comp. Wisd. x. 21 γλώσσας νηπίων ἔθηκε κράς, and Ps. viii. 2 "out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou established strength," quoted in Mt. xxi. 16 "out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected *praise*."

³ In Aramaic and New Hebrew (Levy Ch. i. 99 and Levy i. 234) בלם means both "muzzled" and "lamed."

⁴ Is. xxxv. 4.

⁵ Comp. Acts x. 38, a Petrine utterance describing Jesus as "doing good and healing all that were *oppressed* (καταδυναστευομένους)

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

The thought of a prison leads us to think of the Psalmist's mention of "the sorrowful crying" or "groaning" of "prisoners" mentioned in the Psalms¹ and to ask whether there is any allusion to it in Mark, as if the Messiah were regarded as "sighing" in sympathy with them. If there is, it is probable that the allusion goes further back. For the Psalmist appears to be alluding to the "sighing" and "crying" and "groaning" of Israel in Egypt: "And the children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage, and they cried, and their cry came up unto God...and God heard their groaning²." The word here rendered "*sighed*" occurs nowhere else in the historical books of Scripture. But it occurs in Ezekiel where the Lord says "All flesh shall know that I the Lord have drawn forth my sword out of its sheath....*Sigh*, therefore, thou son of man; with the breaking of thy loins and with bitterness *shalt thou sigh* before their eyes³."

These two passages present two aspects in which the Son of Man, or Messiah, might be regarded as "sighing." The first is that in which He might look up as an intercessor for Israel in bondage so that their cry may "come up unto God," and their bonds be loosed, and their prison-door thrown open. This appears to be represented by Mark here, where Jesus looks up to heaven, and sends up the cry for deliverance, *Ephphatha*,

by the devil," and note the first Biblical instance of καταδυναστεύω, Exod. i. 13 "The Egyptians *made* the children of Israel *to serve* with rigour," καταδυναστεύον βίβλ. Egypt, or Sin, is regarded as an "ergastulum," a place of imprisonment with hard labour, and Pharaoh, or Satan, is regarded as the Master of it.

¹ Ps. lxxix. 11, cii. 20, τὸν στεναγμὸν (ἤρναι, Gesen. "crying," "groaning") τῶν πεπενδημένων.

² Exod. ii. 23—4 "sighed (ἤρναι) κατεστίναξαν," "cried (ἤρναι) ἀνέβησαν," "cry (ἤρναι) βοή," "groaning (ἤρναι) στεναγμὸν." Gesen. 58b renders ἤρναι "sigh, groan." Tromm. gives ἤρναι and ἤρναι as = forms of στένω, στενάω etc. (noun or verb) about twenty times.

³ Ezek. xxi. 5—6.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

"be opened," and the cry is heard and the "bond" is "loosed," and the door is "opened".

The second aspect is that in which the Messiah must be regarded in the character of a judge, looking down on Israel with sadness because, having been rejected as an intercessor, He is compelled to send down judgment rather than to send up intercession. That will come before us in the next section when we study a tradition peculiar to Mark, about a second sighing of Jesus in reply to the demand of the Jews for "a sign". Meantime, before passing to that, we have to ask whether there are any traces of Johannine Intervention, as to this first kind of sighing.

The Fourth Gospel nowhere intervenes by any repetition of this particular Marcan word. But it does intervene, in word as well as thought, by using another Marcan word implying emotional rebuke with groaning⁴. This it applies to Jesus at the grave of Lazarus. There, as here in Mark, Jesus lifted up His eyes to heaven; there He also uttered something, perhaps unutterable in words, expressive of His sorrow and anger at the bondage of human nature to sin and death; there He also cried an *Ephphatha*, or summons to be "opened," in the words "Lazarus, come forth"; and then there followed also a literal

¹ Isaiah's description of the Healing of the Ransomed concludes with the words (xxxv. 10) "And sorrow and sighing shall flee away." Is it fanciful to suppose that the originator of Mark's tradition inserted the "sighing" of Jesus, not only because it was a fact that Jesus *did* "sigh" over a particular act of healing, but also because there was a fitness in the fact? "The sighing of Israel," he might say, "cannot 'flee away' till it is driven out by the sighing of the Saviour. In all their affliction He was afflicted (Is. lxiii. 9)."

² Mk viii. 12, Mt. xvi. 4, Lk. xi. 29.

³ The question is confined to the sighing. We do not deal with Mk vii. 33 which connects healing with spitting and which will be discussed in the comment on Mk viii. 23. Mark and John (ix. 6—7) are the only Evangelists who connect healing with "spitting."

⁴ See *Son* and *Joh. Voc.* Indices on ἐμβρυόδομα used in Jn xi. 33, 38 R.V. "groaned," marg. "was moved with indignation."

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

as well as spiritual "loosing" when "he that was dead came forth *bound* hand and foot with bands of the grave," and Jesus said, "*Loose him*, and let him go¹."

§ 3. *The second "sighing" of Jesus, in Mark*

After the acts of healing described in the last section Mark and Matthew place the Feeding of the Four Thousand, which has been discussed above², and then a request for a sign from heaven³. It is this that, according to Mark, draws a sigh a second time from Jesus, not mentioned by Matthew⁴. The request is made, in Mark, by the Pharisees, but in Matthew by the Pharisees and Sadducees. In John, a similar request is made for "a sign"—meaning "a sign from heaven"—after the Feeding of the Five Thousand, and apparently by some of the Five Thousand themselves: "What then doest thou *for a sign*,

¹ Jn xi. 44.

² For comment on Mk viii. 1—9 in Chapter VIII., see p. 208, n. 1, and Textual Index.

³ Mk viii. 11 (R.V.)

And the Pharisees came forth, and began to question with him, seeking of him a sign from heaven, tempting him.

Mt. xvi. 1 (R.V.)

And the Pharisees and Sadducees came, and tempting him asked him to shew them a sign from heaven.

Lk. xi. 16

And others, tempting [him], sought of him a sign from heaven.

This is preceded by:—

Mk viii. 10 (R.V.)

And straightway he entered into the boat with his disciples, and came into the parts of Dalmanutha.

Mt. xv. 39 (R.V.)

And he sent away the multitudes, and entered into the boat, and came into the borders of Magadan.

The variations in the texts of these passages will be found discussed in detail in *Corrections* 498 g—h. To the remarks there made should be added the hypothesis of an allusion in Dalmanutha (see above, pp. 242—3) to the rare word rendered by R.V. "haven" in Ps. cvii. 30, and the suggestion that a "haven" may be implied in the tradition peculiar to Mark (vi. 53) "they moored to the shore (προσθημισθησαν)" (see p. 443).

⁴ Mk viii. 12 "And he sighed deeply in his spirit (ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ) and saith,..."

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

that we may see and believe thee? . . . Our fathers ate the manna . . . as it is written, He gave them bread out of heaven to eat¹."

Luke describes a request for a sign from heaven as proceeding from "others"—not very clearly defined—immediately after the "marvel" of "the multitudes" at the exorcism of "a dumb devil," and after the assertion of "*some of them*" that Jesus "casteth out devils in Beelzebub²." It will be seen below that

¹ Jn vi. 30, 31. Jesus has previously said to them "Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves." By "ye saw signs" Jesus seems to refer to a previous mention of "beholding signs" in *ib.* vi. 2, "A great multitude followed him because *they beheld the signs that he did on them that were sick.*" The context indicates that John now regards Jesus as saying to these seekers after a new sign "Ye are not like those who followed me because they beheld the signs performed in the healing of sufferers. Ye speak of the ancient 'bread out of heaven,' meaning that ye demand a sign of the same kind—a sign from heaven." So Westcott *ad loc.* "They ask, as in the Synoptists, for 'a sign from heaven.'"

² See *Proclam.* pp. 424 and 428. Luke is printed fully below in order to shew the difficulty of ascertaining the meaning of "*some of them*" and "*others.*" Luke has said nothing about Scribes or Pharisees as being among the "multitudes" whom he has just mentioned.

Mk iii. 20—23 a
(R.V.)

(20) And he cometh into a house...

(21) And when his friends heard it... for they said, He is beside himself.

(22) And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem said, He hath Beelzebub....

(23) And he called them unto him, and said unto them in parables....

Mt. xii. 22—5
(R.V.)

(22) Then...one possessed with a devil, blind and dumb...the dumb man spake and saw.

(23) And all the multitudes were amazed... Is this the Son of David?

(24) But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This man... by Beelzebub....

(25) And knowing their thoughts he said unto them....

Lk. xi. 14—17
(R.V.)

(14) And he was casting out a devil [which was] dumb. And it came to pass, when the devil was gone out, the dumb man spake; and the multitudes marvelled.

(15) But *some of them* said, By Beelzebub the prince of the devils casteth he out devils.

(16) And *others*, tempting [him], sought of him a sign from heaven.

(17) But he, knowing their thoughts, said unto them....

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

the parallel Mark and Matthew mention no such demand. But it is not perhaps—as it appears at first sight to be—irrelevant. It means that, although the multitudes marvelled, the upper classes refused to accept a “sign” of exorcism as proving anything. The dumb devil might be driven out by an agent of the devil on earth. What they wanted was “a sign from heaven,” where the devil could work no sign. This agrees with the above suggested explanation of the Johannine words “Ye seek me, not because ye saw *signs*,” that is, “not because ye saw *the signs of healing performed on the sick*”¹.

It is implied by John that those who asked Jesus for “a sign from heaven” did not know what “heaven” meant. Defining it as a place, or perhaps as seven places (“seven heavens”) of material glory, they did not recognise it as the region of the Supreme Love and Righteousness, the divine Father whose “signs” were to be seen issuing from every son of man, so far as that son of man identified himself with God in love and righteousness, as his Father in heaven. This led them to accuse Jesus—who did identify Himself with the divine nature—of blaspheming God and of making Himself the agent of Satan in the act of curing the diseases of men. Such a perversion of mind, such a determination to call good evil, could not but result in a distortion of the divine image and a substitution of Satan for God, and this it appears to have been that made Jesus, as Mark says, “sigh deeply in his spirit”².

¹ See p. 475, n. 1.

² Comp. *Mart. Polyc.* § 9 ὁ δὲ Πολύκαρπος ἐμβριθεῖ τῷ προσώπῳ εἰς πάντα τὸν ὄχλον τὸν ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ ἀνόμων ἔθνων ἐμβλέψας καὶ ἐπισείσας αὐτοῖς τὴν χεῖρα, στεναῖας τε καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εἶπεν, Αἶρε τοὺς ἀθίους.

The Proconsul had said to Polycarp, “Say, *Away with* (lit. *take away* (*aipe*)) *the atheists!*” The narrative, in a passage that suggests reminiscences of the two Marcan descriptions of Christ’s “sighing,” says that Polycarp “sighed” while he called on God to “take away” the real “atheists,” that is, those who denied the true God by setting up false gods.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

A similar sense of sad and indignant condemnation is implied in the phrase "this generation," which appears, as part of Christ's answer to the demand for a sign, in all the Synoptists¹. It has been shewn elsewhere that in the whole of O.T. "this generation" occurs but twice and means "this evil generation"². In the Gospels it means a transient and rebellious generation that is rejecting the will of Him who abides to all generations. It is a generation like the one that fed on the manna in the wilderness and yet provoked the Lord so that they were not allowed to enter the Promised Land. John never mentions the word "generation," but he implies it in the discourse of Jesus after the Feeding of the Five Thousand. The Jews ask Him for a sign, like the manna, from a local heaven, and say with complacency "Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness." Jesus replies, in effect, "They did indeed. But your 'fathers' were not the true Israel. They were but a passing generation. They ate the manna, but what was the end? Not the Promised Land, but death. They ate—and died³."

Can we find anywhere in John a parallel to this second

¹ Mk viii. 12—13
(R.V.)

(12) And he sighed deeply in his spirit, and saith, Why doth this generation seek a sign? Verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this generation.

(13) And he left them, and again entering into [the boat] departed to the other side.

Mt. xvi. 4 (comp.
xii. 39) (R.V.)

(4) An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of Jonah. And he left them, and departed.

Lk. xi. 29
(R.V.)

(29) And when the multitudes were gathering together unto him, he began to say, This generation is an evil generation: it seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah.

² See *Son* on "This Generation" 3382 v (b)—(f). "This generation," in O.T., occurs only in Gen. vii. 1, Ps. xii. 7.

³ Jn vi. 49 "Your fathers ate the manna in the wilderness—and died," *ib.* 58 "not as the fathers ate—and died." That is to say, the bread from the local "heaven"—called by the Jews (*ib.* 31) "bread out of heaven"—had no power to give heavenly life.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

"sighing" of Jesus recorded by Mark? If anywhere, it is perhaps in the passage describing how He was troubled in the spirit: "When Jesus had thus said, *he was troubled in the spirit* and testified and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me"—where what "Jesus had thus said" was "I speak not of you all. I know whom I have chosen, but—that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me¹." Jesus had previously taken upon Himself the responsibility ("Was it not I that chose?") for choosing the Twelve, of whom He said "one of you is a devil²," and now He is "troubled in the spirit" by the result. This combines a sense of inevitable evil with a sense of responsibility for it, as in Genesis, "It repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart³."

§ 4. *The disciples are said for the second time to have their "heart hardened," in Mark⁴*

On this "hardening of the heart" of the disciples Victor records the following comment: "At one and the same time

¹ Jn xiii. 18—21. On ἀλλ' ὅρα, see *Joh. Gr.* 2105—9.

² Jn vi. 70.

³ Gen. vi. 6. This, however, is not very much like the Marcan "sighing" over "this generation," which rather resembles the weeping of Jesus over Jerusalem (Lk. xix. 41—4).

Comp. *Berach.* 3 a, where a Jewish Rabbi amid the ruins of Jerusalem hears "a Voice cooing like a dove and saying 'Alas, that I have desolated my House, burned my Temple, and banished my children among the nations.'"

⁴ Mk viii. 17

Mt. xvi. 8

And Jesus perceiving it, saith unto them, Why reason ye, because ye have no loaves? Do ye not yet perceive, neither understand? Have ye your heart hardened?

And Jesus perceiving it, said, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have no loaves?

For the context, see above, pp. 210—11, where Mk viii. 14—21, Mt. xvi. 5—12 are printed in parallel columns; see also Textual Index.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

the Lord reproaches their faithlessness and makes the meaning of what He had just said clear: 'Remembering the [miracles of feeding] already performed' (He says), 'ye ought neither to be troubled, on your part, about the absence of loaves, nor to suppose that I, for my part, am speaking to you about this. For it would not be hard for me to bring before you, now as formerly, the loaves that are not here, and to satisfy (*lit.* fulfil) your need. How then do ye not yet understand? But have ye your heart still hardened?' This He says while gradually leading the disciples forward to perception and faith¹."

The defect in this explanation is that it fails to recognise the force of "hardened." It mentions at the beginning "faithlessness"; but that is in Matthew, not in Mark. It implies, at the end, a want of "*perception*" as well as of faith; but "hardness" of heart is a much more grievous defect than a want of "perception." "Hardness" has been mentioned before by Mark in the word *phrōsis*, or "callousness," as causing Jesus grief and indignation². There it denoted absorption in one's own interests and indifference to the suffering of others, uniting the Pharisees with the Herodians³ in a jealous antagonism to Jesus the Healer, and in a determination to destroy Him. And here again the Marcan context mentions "the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod⁴," before warning the disciples against a callousness that made them fail to understand the moral implied by all Christ's acts, and by the words in which He inculcated the doctrine of the living

¹ Cramer on Mk viii. 14—16 ending thus: 'Ἄλλ' ἔτι τὴν καρδίαν ἔχετε πεπωρωμένην; Ταῦτα δὲ φησι κατὰ βραχὺ προβαλὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς εἰς αἰσθησὶν τε καὶ πίστιν.

² See *Proclamation* p. 362 foll. on "the hardening of their heart" in Mk iii. 5.

³ Mk iii. 6.

⁴ Mk viii. 15 "See, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod," Mt. xvi. 6 "the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees," Lk. xii. 1 "the leaven (which is hypocrisy) of the Pharisees." On this, see *Proclamation* p. 365 foll.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

Bread. For that doctrine was in fact a doctrine of self-sacrifice. And the opposite doctrine is that of self-worship—whether in those who profess religion or in those who profess irreligion.

Matthew seems to have softened down the Marcan phrase ("the heart hardened") as being inapplicable to Christ's disciples. And doubtless it is difficult. But its very difficulty confirms its genuineness, and indicates that Jesus used some strong term of this kind to warn His disciples against a worship of this world, a worship of visible and material success, which, if they allowed it to enter into their hearts, would alienate them from Himself, just at the critical time when He was purposing to appeal to them to cast in their lot with Him in spite of apparent failure. Mark, in his own person, has already said about the disciples "they understood not concerning the loaves, but *their heart was hardened*¹"; and now he represents Jesus Himself as, in effect, saying the same thing, "*Understand ye not concerning the loaves even now? Is your heart still hardened against the doctrine of the living Bread?*"

We might object that Mark, in relating the Feeding of the Five Thousand, has said nothing about the doctrine of the living Bread as being part, and an integral part, of Christ's acts and words on that occasion. But Mark might reply "It was not my business to record Christ's words. I have left that to others. But I told my readers that Jesus, before feeding the multitudes, 'began to teach them many things.' And, in effect, what He did teach them was the New Law of the New Kingdom of God. The whole of the day was spent thus²." The reply would justify the Evangelist. And on examining the Synoptic

¹ Mk vi. 52.

² Mk vi. 34 "And he began to teach them many things," Mt. xiv. 14 "...and healed their sick," Lk. ix. 11 "and...he spake to them of the kingdom of God, and them that had need of healing he healed." (See above, Chapter VIII. § 15; and for a more literal rendering see p. 184, n. 4, comp. *Proclam.* p. 208 foll.) Matthew probably believed that the Sermon on the Mount (v. 1—vii. 29) contained the "many things" mentioned by Mark.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

parallels we shall find that Luke actually describes Jesus as speaking about the Kingdom of God. Matthew does not. But that is explicable because Matthew believed that he had already given in detail the "many things" mentioned by Mark in the form of the Sermon on the Mount. That Sermon, or Teaching—Mark might say—contained the New Law; and the Eucharist that followed bestowed, in a rudimentary form, the power to perform the New Law.

John, although he does not follow Mark verbally in applying to the disciples the same word ("harden") that has been applied to the Pharisees¹, nevertheless follows Mark to this extent, that he describes a critical occasion when even the Twelve, stumbling over Christ's doctrine of Bread, seemed in danger of abandoning Him. First "the Jews" contend, questioning the doctrine. Then "many of his disciples"—after "murmuring," and after they had been asked by Jesus whether they were "made to stumble"—finally "went back and walked no more with him." Thus Jesus is led at last to make an appeal to the inmost circle of them: "Jesus said therefore unto the twelve, Can it be that ye, too, desire to go away²?" This is not exactly the same thing as Mark's "Have ye your heart hardened?" But in effect it resembles Mark. It means "Do ye too share in the hardness of heart and blindness of sight predicted by Isaiah and common to all Israel except the remnant³?" We may fairly say that John intervenes in favour of Mark to shew how Christ's doctrine of Bread was followed by a recalcitration of unbelief on the part of many of His disciples into which Mark has given us two faint glimpses, while Matthew and Luke have given us none at all.

It must be admitted, however, that Luke had some justification in putting aside these expressions of Mark, about "the hardening of the heart," in the contexts in which he found

¹ Mk iii. 5.

² Jn vi. 66—7.

³ See *Proclam.* p. 362 on Jn xii. 40 which paraphrases Is. vi. 10.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

them, and also in rejecting the tradition about "the one loaf," and indeed the whole of the Feeding of the Four Thousand with its mention of the *sphurides* as distinct from *cophinoi*¹. Many others beside Victor of Antioch probably interpreted Mark's representation of Christ's argument as follows: "You are afraid because you have only one loaf. But I fed five thousand men with five loaves and you took up twelve *large baskets* (*cophinoi*) of fragments; I afterwards fed fewer men, only four thousand, with more loaves, seven, and you took up only seven *small baskets* (*sphurides*). This should convince you that my power to give you bread does not depend on the number of your loaves, but simply on my will." If Luke put this aside either as being inappropriate to Christ's teaching, or as being based on misunderstanding, or for both these reasons, we ought to be very cautious in condemning him.

Luke certainly knew that at a very early period the twelve *cophinoi* in the Feeding of the Five Thousand were regarded as symbols. The *cophinos* was known everywhere as the "basket" of the Jews that tramped about the Roman Empire². Luke also probably knew that there were traditions about other Eucharistic meals connected with the Lord Jesus before and after His resurrection, some of which were regarded as typical of the admission of the Gentiles to the feast of the Gospel. For these, the *cophinos* would be inappropriate. A Gentile term such as the *sphuris* (corresponding to the Roman *sporta*, or "food-basket") would be more suitable. The same tendency of tradition that led Mark to insert the story about a Syrophenician woman—called "*Hellenis*" or "*Greek*," as distinct from Jews—and to mention her prayer for the metaphorical "crumbs" from the table of the Jews, would lead Mark also to insert a mention of Gentile "baskets" or "*sphurides*" in an account of one of Christ's Eucharistic meals so as to balance the narrative about the Jewish *cophinoi*.

¹ Mk viii. 8, comp. *ib.* viii. 20.

² Juvenal iii. 14, vi. 542.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

But although Luke may be right in rejecting a large part of the Marcan Gospel bearing on the miracles of feeding, he may have included in his rejection some things that it was desirable to retain. In developing the moral teaching deduced from these Eucharistic meals it was very natural that they should need to be distinguished. In the earlier ones, the doctrine of taking up the cross, or denying oneself, would be latent, as it is in the Sermon on the Mount; in the later ones, it might become more prominent, and even so prominent as to overshadow the doctrine of the brotherhood of the children of God. In all of them, however, there was a spiritual doctrine, which could not be rejected without bringing on those who rejected it the reproach of "hardening their heart." If Luke, in omitting Mark's duplicate of the Eucharistic meal, has also omitted a warning actually uttered against a spiritual danger, it would be ungrateful and presumptuous in us—having regard to the difficulty of eliciting the truth—to blame him for this omission; but we ought to be grateful to John for not only supplying what was omitted (the doctrine of sacrifice implied in the breaking of the bread) but also amplifying and emphasizing it in a positive as well as a negative aspect.

§ 5. *Jesus lays His hands twice on a blind man and heals him, in Mark*¹

The only Johannine account of the healing of blindness resembles this narrative (which is peculiar to Mark) in two

¹ Mk viii. 22—6 (R.V.)

(22) And they come unto Bethsaida. And they bring to him a blind man, and beseech him to touch him.

(23) And he took hold of the blind man by the hand, and brought him out of the village; and when he had spit on *(eis, lit. into)* his eyes, and laid his hands upon him, he asked him, Seest thou aught?

(24) And he looked up (*ἀναβλέψας*), and said, I see men; for I behold [them] as trees, walking.

(25) Then again he laid his hands upon his eyes; and

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

respects. (1) The healing may be said, from one point of view, to be not accomplished at once but by stages. (2) In the first of these stages there is "spitting." These two details point to Johannine Intervention. In other respects, however, John differs widely from Mark. There is no ancient comment of much value on either narrative¹, but some verbal peculiarities in Mark demand attention.

Our English Versions do not reveal the peculiarities of Mark's language. They say that the man when healed "saw clearly²." But the word rendered "*clearly*" means, etymologically, and frequently in Greek poetry, "far-beaming" like the sun or moon. Hence it is naturally used of heavenly

Mk viii. 22—6 (R.V.) *contd.*

he looked stedfastly (ἀνέβλεψεν), and was restored, and saw all things clearly (ἐνέβλεπεν τηλαυγῶς ἅπαντα).

(26) And he sent him away to his home, saying, Do not even enter into the village.

Comp. Jn ix. 1—7 (R.V.). And as he passed by, he saw a man blind from his birth. (2) And his disciples asked him, saying, Rabbi, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he should be born blind? (3) Jesus answered, Neither did this man sin, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him. (4) We must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work. (5) When I am in the world, I am the light of the world. (6) When he had thus spoken, he spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and anointed his eyes with the clay (or, and with the clay thereof anointed [his] eyes), (7) And said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam (which is by interpretation, Sent). He went away therefore, and washed, and came seeing.

¹ Chrysostom's comment on Jn ix. 5—7 "Go, wash," has the merit of calling attention to the faith of the blind man as superior to that of Naaman (2 K. v. 10 foll.).

² Mk viii. 25 ἐνέβλεπεν τηλαυγῶς. Comp. Philo i. 579 of Moses seeking to see God, ἐζήτει τὸν τριπόθητον καὶ μόνον τηλαυγῶς ἰδεῖν. Commenting on God's command to Abraham (Gen. xv. 5) to look up to heaven and count the stars, Philo (i. 95) thanks God for having implanted in the soul seeds "far-beaming" like the stars, σπέρματα . . . τηλαυγῇ . . . ὡς τοὺς ἀστέρας ἐν οὐρανῷ. Philo ii. 344 likens the sun, shewing its τηλαυγὲς φέγγος, after eclipse, to Truth, ἥξει πάλιν ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἀναλάμψει φῶς ἀπαστράπτουσα τηλαυγέστατον.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

light, as in the only passage where the adjective occurs in the Psalms, "The commandment of the Lord is (Heb.) *pure*, enlightening the eyes¹."

Further, Mark uses here, in the phrase "having spit into (*not*, upon) his eyes," a word for "eye," *omma*, which he himself does not repeat when he describes Jesus as afterwards putting His hands on the man's "eyes" (where "eye" is *ophthalmos*). *Omnia* is used by Philo, Clement of Rome, and Justin Martyr (following Plato) to mean "the eye of the soul or mind²," but is practically unused in the Greek Testament, Old and New, except in Proverbs³.

Lastly, as regards the gradual nature of the healing, Mark's words, if interpreted as usual in N.T., would imply four stages. The man (1) "*recovered sight*⁴ (R.V. *looked up*)," (2) "*saw*

¹ Ps. xix. 8 τηλαυγής. In Job xxxvii. 21 "bright (τηλαυγής)" is applied to "light" said to be (Heb.) "in the skies." But in Lev. xiii. 2—24 it means "a bright spot" in the flesh.

² See Clem. Rom. § 19 ἐμβλέψωμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς τὸ μακρόθυμον αὐτοῦ βούλημα. Justin Mart. *Tryph.* § 4 quotes Plato on τὸ τοῦ νοῦ ὄμμα as given to us to behold things divine, after saying that τὸ θεῖον cannot be seen ὀφθαλμοῖς, *ib.* § 123 speaks of the "opening of the eyes (ὀφθαλμοί) of proselytes." These are the only instances in Goodspeed. Philo i. 333 (rep. ii. 607) contrasts ὀφθαλμοί and ὀφθαλμοὶ in connection with τηλαυγῆς.

³ Ὀμμα, in canon. LXX, occurs only in Proverbs (four times representing the Heb. "eye" and once in an interpolation). In N.T. it occurs only in Mk above, and in Mt. xx. 34 "he touched *their eyes* (ὀφθαλμοῖς)," where Matthew describes the healing of two blind men, but the parall. Mk x. 52, Lk. xviii. 42 mention only one.

⁴ Ἀναβλέπω in N.T. (Acts as well as Gospels), when used absolutely, (without εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν) mostly means "recover sight." Lk. xix. 5, xxi. 1—of Jesus "looking up" to Zacchaeus in the tree, and to the almsgiving in the Temple—are exceptional. Ἀναβλέψας, unique in Lk. iv. 18 τυφλοῖς ἀναβλέψας, from Is. lxi. 1, means "recovery of sight." Hence, in answer to the question "Dost thou see aught?" we may naturally infer that Mk viii. 24 καὶ ἀναβλέψας ἔλεγεν, βλέπω... means "and having [immediately] recovered sight he said, I see...." On Mk xvi. 4 ἀναβλέψασαι see *Corrections* 527 a, l.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

clearly¹ (R.V. *looked stedfastly*)"—which is emphasized by adding (3) "and he was restored," and (4) "*saw-with-insight in-bright-clearness* all things (R.V. *saw* all things *clearly*)."
The Greek for "see-with-insight," in canonical LXX, is almost peculiar to Isaiah where it is used of "*seeing with insight* the works of the Lord"; and the three Translators use it where Hezekiah says "I shall not see the Lord...I shall not *look-upon man*."

This last passage suggests a partial explanation of the very difficult utterance of the blind man in the first stage of his recovery (about seeing men "as trees"). Hezekiah, when delivered from the impending darkness of death and restored to health, might have said "It has been given to me to see yet again the works of the Lord and to look upon man." Somewhat similarly, here, it is given to the blind man, first, to "see man," but only imperfectly, not clearly nor face to face, but faintly and dimly, shadowy moving objects "as it were trees," and then afterwards to see both man and all other things in the bright light of the perfect truth⁴.

¹ Mk viii. 25 *διέβλεψεν*. *Διαβλέπω* occurs elsewhere in N.T. only in Mt. vii. 5, Lk. vi. 42 *διαβλέψεις* "thou shalt see clearly," i.e. with discrimination. In Mk, R.V. has "looked stedfastly." But *διαβλέπω* has not quite the meaning of insight, or stedfastness, that is in *έμβλέπω*.

² "Saw with insight," *ένέβλεπεν*. *Έμβλέπω* occurs nine times in Isaiah, and only six or seven times in the rest of canon. LXX (with various readings).

³ *Έμβλέπω* with *εις* or dative is freq., but rare with accus. Comp. however Is. v. 12 *τά δέ έργα κυρίου ούκ έμβλέπουσιν* "see with insight," "see the meaning of," and Is. xxxviii. 11 (the complaint of Hezekiah) "I shall not see Jehovah...I shall not any longer *look-upon man* (Aq., Sym., Theod., *ούκ έμβλέψω άνθρωπον ιτι*)...."

⁴ On Is. xxxviii. 11 Ibn Ezra says "The pleasure that man has in this world in understanding the works of the Almighty is first mentioned; and then, in the words, 'I shall behold man no more,' his pleasure in seeing his fellow men." The passage is differently explained by the Targum as though the first clause meant "I shall not appear before the Lord in His Temple."

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

These indications of a typical and allusive meaning in Mark's narrative are not inconsistent with its historical character, which is favoured by many of its details. For example, it takes place at Bethsaida. Now Bethsaida is denounced, in the Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke, for its rejection of the evidence of Christ's mighty works¹. Accordingly Jesus first takes the man out of the town, as though out of an atmosphere of unbelief. Then He resorts to external processes such as those mentioned in the recent healing of "the stammerer." And in this miracle the cure is at first only partial. We may reasonably infer that the man's faith was weak and needed strengthening against Bethsaida influences. Finally comes the warning not to re-enter the place², "Do not so much as go into the village³." A similar suggestion of the infection of unbelief will be found later on, where the disciples absolutely fail to cast out a devil from a child, and Jesus Himself will not attempt it, as long as the father is in the atmosphere of "If thou canst⁴."

In passing out of an atmosphere of darkness and faithlessness into an atmosphere of light and faith, Abraham led the way. To Abraham Philo represents God as saying—with a play on

¹ Mt. xi. 21, Lk. x. 13.

² Mk viii. 26.

³ Bethsaida was a city, not a village. And "village" is hardly explicable from the mere fact that (Schürer II. i. 160) the capitals of districts in Syria are described sometimes as *πόλεις* sometimes as *κώμαι*. But possibly (Swete on Mk viii. 22—3) "Bethsaida Julias may have kept its old style in the popular speech; or one of the villages in its territory may be intended." The latter hypothesis might be illustrated by the reading of D, a, b, i in Mk viii. 27 "*Caesarea Philippi*," where Mark has "*the villages (κώμας)*" (and Mt. xvi. 13 "*the parts (μέρη)*") of "*Caesarea Philippi*." Mark's original, "to a village of Bethsaida," may have been taken as "to a village [named] Bethsaida"; and "village" may have been dropped there as superfluous, but retained in the following narrative. In LXX, *κώμη* represents seven different Hebrew words, see *Proclam.* pp. 240—1, on Mk i. 38 *κωμοπόλεις*, Lk. iv. 43 *πόλεις*.

⁴ Mk ix. 22 foll. This "if thou canst" is in Mark alone.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

the Greek word meaning either "look-up" or "regain-sight"—*"Look-up*, in order to convict the human herd that seems to see, but is blinded¹." Philo also comments on the apparent superfluity of words in the statement that God "led him *out outside*" when He bade him "look up to heaven." This word "*outside*" (he says) means that "the mind that is really desirous of being 'led out' by God, so as to be in perfect freedom, must pass *outside all bodily things*, constraints, organs of perception, sophistic classifications, rhetorical tricks of persuasion—and *finally [outside] its own self*." Here we have, in a Philonian form, Christ's doctrine of "*denying oneself*." Regarded in this light, the Marcan miracle about the blind man who is "*brought out outside*"² Bethsaida—for there is the same verbal superfluity here as in the passage commented on by Philo³—and who is then restored to sight but with the command not to return to the town, comes not inappropriately at this stage of the Gospel where Jesus is on the point of proclaiming the doctrine of "*denying oneself*"⁴.

¹ Philo i. 483 Ἀνάβλεψον, εἰς ἡλεγχον τοῦ τυφλοῦ τῶν ἀγελαιῶν ἀνθρώπων γίνους, ὃ, βλέπειν δοκοῦν, πεπῆρωται.

² Philo i. 95 (on Gen. xv. 5) πάντων ὑπεκοτῆναι σωματικῶν . . . τὰ τελευταῖα καὶ ἐαυτοῦ.

³ Mk viii. 23 ἐξήνεγκεν . . . ἔξω. So the best MSS. It is not surprising that many MSS read ἐξήγαγεν, but comp. Ezr. viii. 17 ἐξήνεγκα αὐτούς, parall. to 1 Esdr. viii. 44 εἶπα αὐτοῖς ἐλθεῖν.

⁴ Philo, on Gen. xv. 5 (i. 95), notes, and corrects, one's first impression, namely, that it is "beside the mark" to add ἔξω to ἐξήγαγεν.

⁵ From the literal point of view no satisfactory explanation has ever been given (as far as I know) of Mk viii. 24 "I see men (*or*, the men, *or* mankind) (τοὺς ἀνθρώπους), because I behold [people] as trees, walking (περιπατοῦντας)." But, if the story was applied mystically and typically as being an "opening of the eyes of man" for salvation, it would be natural to contrast it with the first "opening of the eyes of man," in Genesis, which followed close on his fall. There, as here, a mention is made of "walking," the first Biblical instance of περιπατέω (Gen. iii. 8). But there it is God, not man, who "walks." And "the trees of the garden" are there mentioned merely as man's hiding-place. Rashi testifies to the abundance of mystical interpretations

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

§ 6. *The Johannine healing of blindness*

In John's description of the healing of a blind man, "spitting" is mentioned as follows, "He spat on the ground and made clay from the spittle, and placed the clay thereof on the eyes¹." Thus he avoids the Marcan expression, a somewhat repellent one, that Jesus spat, literally, "into the eyes of the blind man." The original phrase was also perhaps ambiguous, since "in (*or*, into) the eyes of" might be taken to mean "in the presence of," "face to face with," or "in front of²." It would therefore be possible, without much straining of the original tradition, to suppose that Jesus spat, not into the eyes of the blind man but straight forward on the ground, Then in describing the anointing with the spittle, it would

of this narrative, and Philo gives us a specimen of them. There is no external evidence to shew that Mark's narrative, in its original form, contained allusions to Genesis; but internal evidence, and the omission of the narrative by Matthew and Luke, point to some early Marcan misunderstanding.

¹ Jn ix. 6 W.H. txt *ἐπίθηκεν*, marg. *ἐπέχρισεν*. The text varies greatly, SS has "formed clay from his spittle, and took [it] up [and] smeared [it] upon the eyes of that blind man." Nonnus says *ἀνὴρος ἔπλασεν ὄμμα τὸ μὴ φύσει εἶρεν ὁπάσσαι. . . ὀφθαλμοὺς τελῶν νεοτευχίας*, apparently meaning that the man, being born blind, had practically received from nature no eyes and that Jesus made eyes for him. Chrysostom perhaps means something of the same kind when he says "the power that came forth from His mouth by itself both fashioned and opened (*αὐτὴ καὶ διέπλασε καὶ ἀνέφεξε*) the eyes."

² Deut. xxv. 9 "she shall spit in his face" is explained by Rashi as "on the ground," and by Breithaupt as "before his face, i.e. on the ground." Onk. has *באנפיה*, Walton "in faciem ejus," but Jer. Targ. "she shall spit before his face (*קדמיה*) abundant spittle visible to the judges." Comp. J. *Jebam.* xii g. E., 13 a (Levy iv. 436 a) where the judges say "The Jebama spat before our faces (*קודמנא*) spittle that was visible [to us] on the ground." *Hor. Heb.* on Jn ix. 6 describes how R. Meir, for a kind purpose, feigning an ailment in his eyes, said to a woman "Spit seven times upon my eyes." Levy iv. 436 a gives a version that has "speie in mein Gesicht (*באנפיה*)"; Levy i. 113 a says that *באנפיה* with suffix means "in the face of" as in *Baba M.* 86 a "he shut the door in his face."

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

naturally follow that the earth and the moisture were combined into what might be called "clay." No Jewish precedent appears to exist for anointing with such clay¹; but having in view the fact that the Deuteronomic "spitting" which according to the Law was "spitting *in the face*," was interpreted by the Talmud as meaning "spitting *on the ground*," we may not unreasonably suppose that John was at all events right in substituting "the ground" for "the eyes."

When "the ground" had been thus substituted, other circumstances of the healing might naturally be modified so as to suit the change. Nonnus regards the manipulation of the clay as being of a creative nature, as if Jesus created new eyes for the blind man. But the meaning might be that Jesus closed up with clay even the sockets of the bodily eyes in order that the man might entirely give up the old before passing into the new².

It may be said that John, if he has Mark in view, finds no place for the partial and at first imperfect character of the Marcan act of healing. But that, though true, would not be an adequate statement of the fact from a Johannine point of view, which includes spiritual healing. Physically regarded, when the blind man, his eyes plastered up with clay, moves off to the waters of Siloam, he is just as he was before, only with his blindness proclaimed as it were on his face. There is no partial cure at any time. Before he washes he is not

¹ None is alleged by *Hor. Heb.*, Wetstein, Schöttgen, and Schlatter, on Jn ix. 6.

² *Introd.* p. 22 says "In the new-born proselyte, the old eye must be closed before the new one is opened, see Lev. iv. 154*b* quoting Lev. v. (on Lev. xii. 2)." But Levy, interpreting "das Glied das im Mutterleibe geschlossen war" as "die Augen, Ohren u. dgl.," goes rather beyond the text of Lev. v. which seems to refer to the mouth. Philo i. 92 dwells on the need of "concealing and destroying" the passions and says (*ib.* 94) that the self-glorifying intellect must "die" if man is to escape the charge of "murder (*φόνος*). The doctrine of "dying to oneself" in order to "live unto the Lord" is Pauline and based on Christ's own teaching.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

healed. When he has washed he is healed and healed completely. The plastering cannot be confidently alleged to have produced any physical result. It may have been a mere test of faith.

Spiritually, however, there are two distinct stages. In the first, the man born blind is so far enlightened that he maintains, boldly and passionately, that his Healer is "a prophet" and "from God¹." In the next stage, Jesus meets him after he has been cast out of the synagogue and asks him "Believest thou in the Son of man?" The man does not know what this means, but is certain that he has but to know and he will believe: "Who is he, Lord, that I may believe on him?" When he knows, he at once believes and worships, and Jesus contrasts him with the Pharisees: "For judgment came I into this world, that they that see not may see and that they that see may become blind²."

This accords with Christ's saying in Matthew and Luke about God's "hiding" truth from the wise and understanding while "revealing" it to babes³, and with many passages in the Epistles to the same effect; and it is easy to understand that John would attach importance to a miracle of healing wrought on one born blind, who might seem to him a type of the Gentile world. Still, it is startling to find this man described as "worshipping" Jesus—the only mention of actual "worship" in the Fourth Gospel, and the only Johannine instance of the word at all, apart from the worship of God repeatedly mentioned in the Dialogue with the Samaritan Woman and in the brief mention of "Greeks⁴."

¹ Jn ix. 17, 33.

² Jn ix. 35. The reading "Son of Man" (not "Son of God") is confirmed by SS, see *Son* 3452.

³ Jn ix. 39.

⁴ Mt. xi. 25, Lk. x. 21.

⁵ Προσκυνέω, apart from Jn ix. 28, occurs in iv. 20—24 (nine times), and xii. 20 "Greeks...going up to *worship* at the feast."

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

Perhaps, among many traditions about the healing of blindness (beside the Marcan one under consideration) which John had in view in writing this story, there were some based on the prophecy of Isaiah concerning the twofold blindness of Israel:—the blindness of the learned, to whom “the book” of revelation is “sealed,” and that of the unlearned, who confess “I am not learned¹.” The context in Isaiah bears on our investigation. For these words of the prophet precede others quoted by Jesus about the “hypocrites” (“Well did Isaiah prophesy of you *hypocrites*²”). Then follow, at a little interval, words predicting a better time, when “The deaf shall hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind shall *see out of obscurity and out of darkness*³.” This last phrase was in early times variously interpreted as meaning either “*see darkness*,” i.e. *see what was once dark now made light*, or “*see by passing out of darkness*⁴.” Ibn Ezra, adopting the latter, says “Those blind men will not see *until they have already been in darkness*.” Perhaps the Marcan story may be based on one that took the meaning to be “*see at first obscurely and then clearly*,” and the Johannine on one that took the meaning to be “*see the light after passing through a phase of darkness made darker than before*.”

These remarks do not concern themselves with the question whether, or how far, the Johannine narrative is unhistorical, or whether it is merely a version of the Marcan narrative. The object is to shew that there were probably many floating traditions about Christ's healing of blindness besides those mentioned in the Synoptic Gospels⁵. It is practically certain

¹ Is. xxix. 11—12.

² Is. xxix. 13 quoted in Mk vii. 6 foll., Mt. xv. 8 foll.

³ Is. xxix. 18.

⁴ See Jerome *ad loc.*, who says that Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus translated it “*tenebras et caliginem...videbunt*, ut ostenderent gentium populo qui prius caecus erat, Christi Sacramenta pandenda....”

⁵ The first mention of blindness in Mark is in viii. 22 foll. But

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

that the language of these stories would be affected in the earliest days of the Church by the language of the prophets, and especially Isaiah¹. It is certain that Jesus had Isaiah in view when He attacked the blindness of the Pharisees, and probable that He had it in view when He healed blindness. These considerations, although they do not justify confident inferences about the precise results of Isaiah's influence in the Johannine narrative, confirm the conclusion that we have, in the healing of the man born blind, an instance of Johannine Intervention. John intervenes, in view of the Marcan miracle of healing blindness by spitting, to shew that the spitting was but a small detail in a similar miracle of a still more wonderful nature.

Inferring that the spitting was "on the ground" and that "clay" was thus compounded, John leads us to a further inference—natural for those who were familiar with the thought of God's creation of man out of the ground and with the language of Hebrew poets and prophets, "I also am formed out of the clay," "Thou art our father, we are the clay²." Christ's act is regarded, not as ameliorative, but as creative. The Psalmist said "Make anew in me a right spirit³." Jesus creates "a new eye"—for the man born blind, the representative of the Gentile world.

§ 7. "*Prophet*," "*Son of Man*," "*Christ*"

The parallel texts below shew that Matthew differs from Mark and Luke by representing Jesus as saying, not "I," but

Matthew mentions it as being healed at an earlier date, while John the Baptist was still in prison, Mt. ix. 27 foll., xi. 5 (comp. Lk. vii. 21), and also xii. 22 (τυφλὸν καὶ κωφόν), and xv. 30—31. Then follows xx. 30 δύο τυφλοί, parall. to Mk x. 46 (Bartimaeus) (Lk. xviii. 35 τυφλός τις), and then xxi. 14 ("blind and lame in the temple," pec. to Matthew).

¹ Strong's Concordance gives "blind" as occurring in Isaiah eleven times, as against four times in all the rest of the Prophets.

² Job xxxiii. 6, Is. lxiv. 8 etc.

³ Ps. li. 10, parall. to "*Create in me a clean heart.*"

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

"the Son of Man," when He questions them about men's opinions concerning Himself¹. Reasons have been given for

¹ Mk viii. 27—29
(R.V.)

(27) And Jesus went forth, and his disciples, into the villages of Caesarea Philippi: and in the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them, Who do men say that I am?

(28) And they told him, saying, John the Baptist: and others, Elijah; but others, One of the prophets.

(29) And he asked them, But who say ye that I am? Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ.

Mt. xvi. 13—16
(R.V.)

(13) Now when Jesus came into the parts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Who do men say that the Son of man is? (*many anc. auth. that I the Son of man am?*)

(14) And they said, Some [say] John the Baptist; some, Elijah: and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets.

(15) He saith unto them, But who say ye that I am?

(16) And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

Lk. ix. 18—20
(R.V.)

(18) And it came to pass, as he was praying alone, the disciples were with him: and he asked them, saying, Who do the multitudes say that I am?

(19) And they answering said, John the Baptist; but others [say] Elijah; and others, that one of the old prophets is risen again.

(20) And he said unto them, But who say ye that I am? And Peter answering said, The Christ of God.

Caesarea Philippi might be thought by readers of Mark to be called after the Philip (Herod Philip) previously mentioned in Mark (vi. 17). But it was called after Philip the Tetrarch. About A.D. 55 it was called Neronias (Madden p. 116) and subsequently resumed its old name Paneas. Luke (iii. 1) mentions Philip the Tetrarch, but does not mention Herod Philip by name though referring to him in iii. 19 "Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias his brother's [*i.e.* Herod Philip's] wife." John abstains from these names—perhaps as being void of interest for his readers. The only Philip that John mentions—eleven times as against once in each of the Synoptists—is the Apostle.

As regards Mk viii. 27 "*in the way*," omitted by Matthew and Luke, we should note that it is used for "the way [of the Christians]" in Acts xix. 23, "no small disturbance about *the Way*," xxiv. 22 "having more exact knowledge about *the Way*," so that it might sometimes be used about Jesus leading His disciples on "*in the Way*," *i.e.* in the revelation of the Way of Life. When Mark (alone) says that Bartimaeus (x. 52) "followed Jesus *in the way*," it is very probable that there was a poetic play on the phrase "He was restored to sight and followed Jesus *in the Way [of Light]*." Mark also alone

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

believing that Matthew is right. Jesus had deliberately called Himself "Son of Man" (or "Son of Adam," like Ezekiel) and wished to be known by that title, and not by that of "Prophet." But He used it, without defining it, always having in view the likeness suggested in Scripture between "the son of man" and God. We appear to have reached a turning point in Christ's use of the title, when, for the first time, after hearing the definitions of the multitudes, He asks the disciples to define it according to their own experience¹.

If this is so, it would seem that Jesus felt the multitudes to have done Him no honour, but on the contrary to have misunderstood Him, when they called Him the greatest of the Prophets, or the wonder-working Elijah. It was not as a prophet nor as a wonder-worker that He desired to appeal to them. It was as "the Man"—in Hebrew or Aramaic "the son of man," or perhaps "the son of Adam." The Man or the Son of Man was to be felt by them to be so divine as to be one with God, or with the Son of God. Peter, in Mark, responds to the appeal by giving his Master a title distinguishing Him from all the prophets, "Thou art the Christ." This is amplified by Matthew as "the Christ, the Son of the living God," and by Luke as "the Christ of God."

Matthew and Luke seem to have deemed Mark to be abrupt and obscure. And they seem right. "The Christ," i.e. "the Anointed," would mean little or nothing to most Gentiles unless one added something connecting the title with God. This is not an instance where Luke omits anything that is in Mark. Luke adds something. But as the addition is of the nature of an alteration we naturally ask what, if anything,

speaks of Bartimaeus as "*casting away* (*ἀποβαλὼν*)" *his cloak*. Comp. Clem. Rom. § 35 "*Let us follow the Way of Truth having cast off* (*ἀπορρίψαντες*) *from ourselves all unrighteousness....*" Hermas, who often uses Marcan expressions, speaks metaphorically of "*coming to the Way*," and of "*not abiding in the Way*," meaning "*in the Christian Faith*" (see *Vis.* iii. 2. 9 and iii. 7. 1).

¹ See *Son* 3179—81.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

John has to say, bearing on this addition (as also on Matthew's) when he represents Peter, or others, as making a confession similar to that in the Synoptists.

What John says, in effect, is this: "To say, *Thou art the Christ* was, in itself, nothing. All depended on the spirit in which the confession was made. '*Christ*' is only a translation of the Aramaic '*Messiah*.' About this matter, I have said something early in the Gospel, as soon as one of the disciples for the first time spoke concerning the Lord Jesus: 'Andrew first findeth his own brother Simon and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah (which is, being interpreted, *Anointed*)¹.' Thus it has been seen that Andrew was the first disciple to call Jesus '*Messiah*' and that Peter heard the title from his brother. But Jesus pronounced no blessing on Andrew. Nor did He praise Nathanael, a little later, when Nathanael said, '*Thou art God's Son*.' On the contrary, the Lord implied that there was in store for Nathanael a higher revelation or vision not about the Son of God, but about the Son of Man, in which he would see *God's angels ascending and descending on the Son of man*².

"Wherein then consisted the special merit of Peter's Confession? In two respects. First, in the things around Peter at the time. The multitudes had failed to understand the sign given by the Lord Jesus to the Five Thousand. They had called Him merely 'the prophet,' and they purposed to snatch Him away and 'make' Him 'king.' His own disciples also had failed to understand His doctrine about the living Bread, and had mostly abandoned Him. Secondly, there was something special, or new, in Peter's own heart. Peter did

¹ Jn i. 41 "*Anointed, Χριστός.*" John cannot interpret "*anointed*," because it is Greek already. The Greek reader is supposed to know that *christos* means "*anointed for a sacred or royal office*" and not "*anointed for secular purposes (ἀλημιμένος).*" See above, p. 175, n. 5, on the two kinds of anointing; and comp. p. 183.

² Jn i. 51.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

not now think of Jesus as 'Messiah' in the same sense in which he accepted Him as 'Messiah' on the day when Andrew called Him by that title. Now he knew Jesus through experience, as his only hope in his search after truth ('Lord, to whom shall we go?') and as one from whose presence there breathed the very holiness of God. Perhaps Peter actually said merely *Thou art the Messiah*, as Mark has handed down. But in any case he meant more than the formal meaning of that title. He meant that Jesus was, to him, one who had the words of eternal life, not a saint, but the saint of saints, the Holy One of God. In this form the confession will be such as may be understood by Greeks, and in this form it will be right for me to record it¹."

Looked at in this way, Peter's confession is seen to be the result as it were of natural religion. It is a kind of tribute to humanity and to its divine nature. Christ came to be man, and to be loved as man, and by being loved thus, to attract His brethren, the sons of man, into the love of God the Father in heaven, in whose image man is made. This attraction may be illustrated by the progress or spiritual ascent of the man born blind. The man's conviction about Jesus at first extends no further than this, "he is a prophet." Then he declares that Jesus must be "from God." Lastly, in answer to the appeal "Dost thou believe in the Son of man?" he replies "And who is he, Lord, that I may believe on him?" Then he "worships" Jesus².

¹ Jn vi. 68—9 "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast words of eternal life. And we [firmly] believe and [assuredly] know that thou art the Holy One of God," on which see *Joh. Gr.* 2442—3.

² On Jn ix. 35—6 and on the reading "Son of man" as preferable to "Son of God," see *Son* 3452—3.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

§ 8. "Get thee behind me, Satan," in Mark and Matthew¹

Although Mark does not say that Peter "worshipped" Jesus we perceive from the Three Gospels, in the light of the Fourth, that Peter had reached to a combination of love, trust, and awe, of such a nature as to constitute true worship. Now therefore the time had come when Jesus deemed it right to set before Peter (and his companions) what Peter's confession meant. For it did not mean what Peter consciously thought it meant. He had said "Thou art the Messiah."

¹ Mk viii. 30—33
(R.V.)

(30) And he charged them that they should tell no man of him.

(31) And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again.

(32) And he spake the saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him.

(33) But he turning about, and seeing his disciples, rebuked Peter, and saith, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men.

Mt. xvi. 20—23
(R.V.)

(20) Then charged he the disciples that they should tell no man that he was the Christ.

(21) From that time began Jesus (*some anc. auth.* Jesus Christ) to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up.

(22) And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee (*or*, [God] have mercy on thee), Lord: this shall never be unto thee.

(23) But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art a stumbling-block unto me: for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men.

Lk. ix. 21—22
(R.V.)

(21) But he charged them, and commanded [them] to tell this to no man;

(22) Saying, The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

But he had unconsciously meant "Thou art Thyself, whose saving helpfulness and sustenance to my soul I cannot express, but I try to express it by giving thee the name commonly bestowed on the Saviour of Israel."

But to Jesus the title implied, and had perhaps implied for some time, even before the execution of John the Baptist, a great deal more than this¹. It implied suffering. And Peter's Confession came to Him as a confirmation of a revelation from the Father that He, the Son, was to be the Sufferer: "Thou art the Suffering Servant of the Lord. Thou art the representative of the spiritual Israel, God's Firstborn, destined to be delivered up by the Father to humiliation and suffering for the sins of others, and not to rise out of them till an interval shall have elapsed according to the words of Hosea which speak of God as having 'smitten' Israel: 'He *hath smitten* and he will bind us up. After two days will he revive us; on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him².'" "

Here, the Hebrew for "smitten" is ambiguous³. It is not surprising therefore if Mark, or Mark's original, in rendering

¹ The Epistle to the Hebrews appears to teach us that Jesus (Heb. v. 8) "learned," as time went on, things not revealed at first, namely, that He was to be "rejected" and "smitten." There is nothing to indicate that this anticipation of rejection was—and much to indicate that it was not—taught by Jesus, or definitely recognised by Jesus, at the beginning of His preaching.

² Hos. vi. 1—2, "hath smitten," LXX *παράγει*.

³ "Smite (*παράσσω*)" is used by Jesus Himself (Mk xiv. 27, Mt. xxvi. 31) (in quoting Zechariah (xiii. 7)) "I will smite (Heb. נָכָה 'smite,' LXX *παράγει*) the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered." The Heb. נָכָה (LXX diff.) occurs also in Isaiah's prophecy about the Suffering Servant (liii. 4) "Yet we esteemed him . . . smitten by God." In both these passages it might naturally be interpreted as "smitten unto death," that is to say, "killed," and that is the rendering of the word nine times in LXX; and our Authorised Version renders it "kill" repeatedly where the Revised Version has "smite"; but in some cases the latter, too, has "kill," as the sense often absolutely demands. These facts are taken from *Son* 3198—9, which see for detailed references.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

into Greek the prediction of Jesus based on Hosea and meaning "*shall be smitten*," has paraphrased it as "*shall be killed*." Yet the context, "*he will bind us up*," shews that the word did not in Hosea imply "killing."

The phrase in the three Synoptists, "suffer many things," appears to allude mainly to Isaiah's description of the Suffering Servant¹. This is confirmed by the fact that Justin Martyr, in his Apology, after saying that Jesus "endured to *suffer*," and appealing to his hearers to "hear the prophecies that relate to this," proceeds to quote nearly the whole of that description in Isaiah².

In this prediction of the Passion there is no deviation of Luke from Mark and therefore no call for Johannine Intervention³. But in what follows, Luke omits both the remonstrance made by Peter, and the rebuke addressed to Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan." If John could not be proved to intervene here, the law of Johannine Intervention would conspicuously fail. Reasons can be given for believing that it does not fail. Luke's omission, if his honesty, research, and accuracy are to be assumed, is to be explained on the supposition that the tradition about Peter and Satan is erroneous. An error, very slight indeed, merely the disarrangement of one or two letters, appears to have resulted in substituting a rebuke for what was originally a warning, or an appeal. It was a moment when crowds of Christ's disciples were ceasing to follow Him, and "departing backward" to follow in the ways of the Ruler of this world. If Jesus said to Peter, "Goest thou, too, behind [*i.e.* after] Satan?"—meaning "Art thou following (*or*,

¹ For the proof of this, see *Son* 3184—5.

² *Apol.* § 50, quoting Is. liii. 12, lii. 13—15, liii. 1—8, comp. *Apol.* § 51.

³ John, of course, does in some sense intervene, but not as between Mark and Luke. He intervenes to indicate that the Passion was a Glorification. Instead of "crucify" he says "lift up," and other expressions he alters in the same way. See *Son*, Index "lift up."

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

Thou art following) Satan"?—this would be easily mistaken for "Go thou behind me, Satan."

In this misunderstood tradition, it would seem that John perceived "Satan" to mean "the ruler of this world," the spirit of worldliness, which, at a critical moment in Christ's career, was urging the multitudes—not without some support from Christ's own disciples, and especially Judas—to constrain Him to resort to arms in order to avenge the death of John the Baptist. In doing this, they were not "going after the Son of Man"; they were "going after Satan." John suggests this in the context, though very indirectly. He represents Jesus as saying, in effect, to the Twelve, after Peter's loyal confession, "Ye are not all like Peter; he is following after me; but one of you, you the Twelve, you whom I myself have chosen—one of you is a servant of Satan¹." It is highly probable that John is historically right in thus intervening; but it is more than probable that he does intervene.

§ 9. *Variations in the expression of the New Law*²

We have now reached the point where Jesus proclaims the

¹ Jn vi. 67, 71. *From Letter 891 b and Son 3528 b* give this explanation of Mk viii. 33, Mt. xvi. 23. Also note that Mt. *ib.* *σκανδαλον εἰ ἐμοῦ* (Mk om.) might contain some corruption of *σκανδαλίσω*, a verb freq. in Aquila. The passive *σκανδαλοῖ* would mean "thou art offended."

² Mk viii. 34—ix. 1
(R.V.)

(34) And he called unto him the multitude with his disciples, and said unto them, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.

(35) For whosoever would save his life (or, soul) shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life (or, soul) for my sake

Mt. xvi. 24—8
(R.V.)

(24) Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.

(25) For whosoever would save his life (or, soul) shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life (or, soul) for my sake

Lk. ix. 23—7
(R.V.)

(23) And he said unto all, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.

(24) For whosoever would save his life (or, soul) shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life (or, soul) for my sake,

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

Law of the New Kingdom, the Law of the Gospel or Good Tidings of "great peace." The New Kingdom is the Kingdom in which there reigns, as king, not Satan the Adversary, but God the Father; and there obey, as subjects, not a horde of quarrelling competitors, but a family of concordant brothers; and the Law is not that of greedy or envious desire but that of brotherly love and zeal for the common welfare. That being

<p>Mk viii. 34—ix. 1 (R.V.) <i>contd.</i></p> <p>and the gospel's shall save it.</p> <p>(36) For what doth it profit a man, to gain the whole world, and forfeit his life (<i>or, soul</i>)?</p> <p>(37) For what should a man give in exchange for his life (<i>or, soul</i>)?</p> <p>(38) For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with (?) the holy angels*.</p> <p>(ix. 1) And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them that stand [by], which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power.</p>	<p>Mt. xvi. 24—8 (R.V.) <i>contd.</i></p> <p>shall find it.</p> <p>(26) For what shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life (<i>or, soul</i>)? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his life (<i>or, soul</i>)?</p> <p>(27) For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds (<i>iii. doing</i>).</p> <p>(28) Verily I say unto you, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.</p>	<p>Lk. ix. 23—7 (R.V.) <i>contd.</i></p> <p>the same shall save it.</p> <p>(25) For what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose or forfeit his own self?</p> <p>(26) For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in his own glory, and [the glory] of the Father, and of the holy angels*.</p> <p>(27) But I tell you of a truth, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God.</p>
--	---	---

In John, the doctrine about "losing" the soul by "loving" it, and "keeping" the soul by "hating" it, seems addressed to (xii. 23) Andrew and Philip ("Jesus answereth them") but overheard by (ib. 29) "the multitude." Comp. Mk viii. 34 "the multitude with his disciples," where Mt. xvi. 24 has "his disciples," and Lk. ix. 23 "all."

* Mk τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων, but Lk. τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων, see p. 518.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

the case we might expect Jesus, when proclaiming this New Law, to announce it as one that brings peace under divine protection, according to the saying in Proverbs, "When a man's ways please the Lord he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him¹."

Epictetus represents his ideal philosopher as exclaiming—under the protection of a peace proclaimed, not by Caesar but by God—"Now no evil can befall me...all things are full of peace, full of untroubled calm. In road or city, among crowds or neighbours or companions—nothing and no one can harm me²." And how, it might be asked, could a Christian fail to enjoy the same peace if he fulfilled the New Law, as set forth in the Sermon on the Mount? If a man "loves his enemies," how can he fail to be at "peace" with them, and much more with all the rest of the world?

Mark with peculiar frequency mentions that "gospel," or "good tidings," which Isaiah has taught us to connect with peace; yet in his own Gospel he hardly ever mentions the word "peace³." In Matthew, the opening of the Sermon on the Mount makes it clear to Christ's disciples that although they are to "love," they are to expect to be hated and persecuted; and Matthew places a benediction on *those persecuted in the past* before the benediction on those *that* are to be persecuted in the future⁴—as if to shew that such persecution is according

¹ Prov. xvi. 7. One of the many Jewish interpretations of this passage (see Gen. v. on Gen. xxi. 22, Wü. p. 257) declared that a man's "enemies" are in his own heart, his own evil tendencies. Comp. Origen on Ps. cxix. 157 "many are my persecutors," on which he quotes Mt. v. 10 "blessed are they that have been persecuted" and says "The [mention of] multitude hints at enemies visible and invisible...."

² Epict. iii. 13. 13.

³ Is. lii. 7 "good tidings...peace." Mark has εἰρήνη only in v. 34 "go in *peace*" (but he has εἰρηνεύω in ix. 50 "*be-at-peace* with one another").

⁴ Mt. v. 10 "Blessed are those *that have been persecuted* because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven"—where

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

to precedent. "Princes," says the Psalmist, "have *persecuted* me without a cause...but thy law do I love...great *peace* have they that love thy law, and they have none occasion of stumbling¹."

These words may explain the language of Jesus, proclaiming the New Law at a time when John the Baptist had recently been imprisoned and when the Pharisees, who had not raised a finger in the prophet's behalf, appeared to be preparing for Jesus a similar fate. Jesus was at "peace," and He desired all His disciples to be at "peace," and He sent to John a message of blessing for those who should find no occasion of stumbling². But it was "peace" internal and spiritual. It rejected all servile bowing and bending to tyrannical kings and to tyrannical priests or scribes, even more absolutely and on higher grounds than did the "peace" of Epictetus; who was a friend to all, but a slave to none, and an inflexible foe to evil in every form. The peace promised in Proverbs was conditional:—"When a man's ways please the Lord." The same condition is recognised in Luke, "peace on earth among *men with whom [God] is well pleased*³." It was not possible that Jesus could patch up a "peace" with those Pharisees of His day with whom God was *not* "well pleased." They seemed to Him to be destroying the Temple of God, being the direct successors of those ancient prophets (spoken of by Ezekiel) who "daubed" the wall with untempered mortar "saying, 'Peace,' and there was no peace⁴."

Returning to Mark, and bearing in mind that he omits almost all the utterances in the Sermon on the Mount, we

A.V. "*they which are persecuted*" misses the meaning. There is no parallel to this in Luke. A partial parallelism is taken up in the next verse Mt. v. 11 "Blessed are ye when [men] shall revile you..." Lk. vi. 22 "Blessed are ye when men (*οἱ ἄνθρωποι*) shall hate you..."

¹ Ps. cxix. 161—5.

² Mt. xi. 6, Lk. vii. 23 *ὅς ἐστιν* (Lk. *ἐάν*) *μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί*.

³ Lk. ii. 14.

⁴ Ezek. xiii. 10.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

ought to study with special care any Marcan sayings that appear to be equivalent to the blessing pronounced on the endurance of persecution—any that shew *how* a man is to fulfil the condition that his “ways” shall “please the Lord,” so that, even in the face of “enemies,” he may obtain the “peace” promised to those “with whom God is well pleased.” Such a condition is expressed in Mark, first, negatively and obscurely (“let him deny himself”); then positively but, as we shall see, still very obscurely (“take up his cross”); then again positively (“follow me”). It is implied that those who thus “follow” Jesus must be ready to “lose” their life (*or*, soul) for His sake, but, while “losing” it in one form, they will “save” it in another form, wherein it is the most precious of all possessions.

Mark concludes with a prediction of Jesus about what the Son of Man, when He “comes” in glory, will do to those who have been “ashamed” of Him in this adulterous and sinful generation. He will be “ashamed” of them as they have been “ashamed” of Him. The meaning apparently is that He will say to those who have ignored or renounced or denied Him, that He also ignores or renounces or denies them. Such a “denial” is attributed to Jesus elsewhere by Matthew, and it is implied in the parallel Luke¹. In the parallel to the present passage of Mark, Luke alone retains the statement that the Son of Man will “be ashamed,” while Matthew—apparently softening down an expression that might repel some readers—paraphrases the words as meaning that those who sinned shall receive, by a *lex talionis*, a punishment proportioned to their offence².

¹ Mt. x. 33 ἀπρόσους, Lk. xii. 9 διαπρηθίσσας. Comp. Mt. vii. 23 “I never knew you,” parall. to Lk. xiii. 27 “I know not whence ye are.”

² On Matthew’s deviation, see SON 3211 foll. where it is illustrated (3213) by the Targum which paraphrases Ps. xviii. 26 “*thou* [i.e. God] wilt *shew thyself froward* with the perverse” into “*thou didst cause the Egyptians who devised evil devices...to be confounded in their own devices.*”

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

These variations of expression, which somewhat obscure the doctrine underlying them, must now be investigated, phrase by phrase. It will be found that under the phrases "denying oneself," "taking up the cross," "losing one's life," there is latent a doctrine inculcating the higher life, the life of the spirit as compared with that of the flesh, the life of Abraham the friend of God and man, as compared with that of Nimrod the rebel against God and hunter of the souls of men.

§ 10. "Denying oneself"

The Greek Thesaurus gives several instances of "denying" in the sense of "declining"—or (perhaps better) "renouncing"—a practice or habit; and (in later Greek) a mother may be said to "deny," *i.e.* "renounce," a daughter, or a husband a wife¹. But it gives no instance of "denying oneself." Hermas, who is a storehouse of Marcan phrases, contains abundant instances of Christians "denying the Lord," or "denying their own Law [*i.e.* the Law of the City of God in which they dwell]," or "denying their own Life [*i.e.* the Lord who is their life]"; but not (as far as I know) an instance of "denying oneself²."

Epictetus to a boastful sensualist, enslaved by his passions yet pretending to be a philosopher and free, addresses the

¹ Steph. *Thes.*, under ἀρνέομαι, quoting Nonnus *Dion.* iv. 36 Μήτηρ... τεὴν ἡρνήσαο κόρυνη; and other passages.

² Harnack's Index gives none. I have not tested all those in Goodspeed. For "denying" Law or Life, see Hermas *Sim.* i. 5, viii. 3. 7, *Vis.* ii. 2. 7. Denying, in the sense of ignoring or renouncing persons, is (in effect) imputed in the Song of Moses to Levi (*Deut.* xxxiii. 9) "Who said of his father and of his mother, 'I have not seen him'; neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor knew he his own children." Philo allegorizes this, so that Levi "kills," not his "brethren," but "the body that is 'brother' to the soul" (i. 559) καὶ κτείνει ἕκαστος ἀδελφόν... ἀδελφὸν μὲν ψυχῆς τὸ σῶμα, *i.e.* "mortifies" the body. Comp. *ib.* i. 367 (also on *Deut.*) "separated from the pleasures that are according to the 'brother' body (ἀπηλλαγμένος τῶν κατὰ τὸ ἀδελφὸν σῶμα ἡδονῶν)."

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

following rebuke: "Speak the truth, slave, and do not play the runaway from your masters, and *deny* [them]¹." And Hermas says, "If the Gentiles punish their slaves when one *denies his master*, what (think you) will the Master do to you²?" Jesus assumes that man will serve one of two Masters, God and Mammon, and cannot serve both³. In Scripture, God is the One Husband and Lord of Israel. The forms of Mammon may be represented by the false gods sought after by Israel when the nation fell into that idolatry which their prophets regarded as adultery; but in fact they are forms of the lower Self rebelling against the higher. Hence Philo says concerning Adam and Eve, when they ran away from God and hid themselves in the trees after the Serpent had misled them, "He that runs away from God flees into himself⁴." That is to say, he runs away from the freedom of serving the righteous Father of all, into the slavery of serving demons, his own unrighteous and selfish desires⁵. Later on, Philo presents us a contrast in Abraham, whose mind is led out from slavery to freedom, making its way out, as the free mind must, from all the constraints and shackles of the fleshly nature, until finally it passes even "out of itself⁶."

§ II. "Taking up the cross" and "following"

At this point we come to a Synoptic expression, avoided by John, which does not seem capable of being explained from Jewish thought and expression alone. If we look beneath the Synoptic expression we may see the Jewish thought, but not otherwise. An original Jewish tradition about "*taking up the*

¹ Epict. iv. 1. 146 ἀπαρνῶ.

² Hermas Sim. ix. 28. 8.

³ Mt. vi. 24, Lk. xvi. 13.

⁴ Philo i. 93 ὁ γὰρ ἀποδιδράσκων θεὸν καταφεύγει εἰς ἑαυτόν.

⁵ Comp. Rom. vi. 16.

⁶ Philo i. 95 χρὴ γὰρ τὸν μάλλοντα νοῦν ἐξάγεσθαι... ὑπεκοτῆναι... τὰ τελευταία καὶ ἑαυτοῦ.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

yòke" appears to have been transmuted into a Greek tradition about "*taking up the cross*." How this may have taken place has been explained in previous parts of *Dialessarica*¹.

Reasons have been there given for believing that the "cross" here mentioned was originally "the cross-piece of the yoke," and that it represented "the yoke of the Lord" as compared with "the yoke of this world," or of Mammon, or of the flesh. The Targum on Lamentations, "It is good for a man that he bear *the yoke* in his youth," explains the meaning to be "*the yoke of the precepts*," and then adds as a paraphrase of the next verse, "He will sit alone and be silent and will bear the chastisements that befall him, *for the sake of the unity of the Name of God*..."² As a fact, "chastisements" befell Christians in the same way "*for the sake of the Name*" of Christ the Crucified. "*The yoke of Christ*" was the symbol not only of allegiance to the Crucified, but also of a willingness to share in His sufferings, and even (if need arose, as in the case of Peter, who is related to have been crucified) in His Cross itself. It was therefore very natural that "the yoke" should be transmuted into "the cross."

Yet, owing to the transmutation, there arose a danger of missing one aspect of the meaning that comes out more clearly in the Jewish metaphorical contrast between the yoke of the ruler of this world and the yoke of the Kingdom of God: "If any one desires to come after me as my follower, let him *renounce the yoke of sin, the yoke of his own fleshly nature*; and let him take on himself the yoke that I bear, *the yoke of the New Law, the yoke of filial service to the Father in heaven* and of brotherly service to His children on earth."

In this sense, a Christian is called on to take up his cross

¹ See *From Letter 928* (i)—(x) and *Notes 2842—9* for the reasons for the disuse of such traditions as Mt. xi. 29 "Take my yoke upon you," which represented Christ's fundamental doctrine.

² Lam. iii. 27—8. It is added that the chastisements in this world are sent to spare the sufferer chastisements in the next world.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

"daily," and Luke is justified in inserting the word. But, even with that insertion, there is some danger of misunderstanding "the cross" by separating it from the thought of service to men in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by taking it to mean mere suffering—"putting oneself in the way of persecution," or "imperilling one's life," or "subjecting oneself to hardship or discomfort." It is perhaps in allusion to Christian action (based on such a misunderstanding) that Epictetus warns his disciples to make up their minds which of two courses they will take, when standing before a judge's tribunal. If they decide to be silent, or to defy the judge, let them be prepared for the consequences: "For if you have a mind to be crucified, only wait [silently for it] and the cross will come." If they decide to plead for their lives, let them do it in a manner consistent with a philosopher's self-respect¹.

John never mentions "yoke" and never speaks of "taking up the cross" as a duty imposed on Christ's followers. In the only passage where he mentions "cross" he uses it literally, though perhaps there is a symbolism in the first mention of it: "They therefore received Jesus [from Pilate], and he, *carrying the cross for himself*, went forth unto the place called The place of a skull²." Yet the *thoughts* of "cross" and "yoke" both find a place in his Gospel. The "cross" implies persecution and tribulation; and Jesus says "If they have persecuted me they will also persecute you," and "The hour cometh that every one that killeth you will think that he offereth service to God,"

¹ Epict. ii. 2. 20. This is the only mention of "cross" in Epictetus. See Ign. Rom. § 4 for illustrations of the passion for martyrdom, "Let me be given to the wild beasts," "Entice the wild beasts that they may become my sepulchre."

² Jn xix. 17 βαρτάζων αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν On this, see Joh. Voc. 1792 b. "Cross" is repeated, literally, in *ib.* 19, 25, 31. Comp. Heb. xiii. 11—13 "...without the camp. Wherefore also Jesus... suffered without the gate. Let us therefore go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach."

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

and, "In the world ye have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have gained the victory over the world¹."

Again the "yoke" implies service. And Christ's "yoke" implies willing service. It may be called that of a *doulos*, *i.e.* "bondservant" or "slave"—provided that the slave is willing. But it is more appropriately called that of a *diaconos*, *i.e.* "minister." Such a service, implying a sacrifice of one's own will or comfort to the welfare of others, is dramatized in the scene where Jesus washes the feet of the disciples. But the preparation for that scene comes a little earlier, just after Jesus has proclaimed "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified." How is He to be "glorified"? The answer is, "By losing His life in order to gain it," or, in the words of the Gospel, "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but, if it die, it beareth much fruit. He that loveth his soul [*i.e.* life in the flesh] loseth it [*i.e.* life in the spirit], and he that hateth his soul in this world shall keep it unto life eternal. If any man [be minded to] be ministering unto me, let him follow me, and where I am, there shall also my minister be. If any man be ministering unto me, him will my Father honour²."

Here all the Synoptic thoughts are expressed in Johannine words as being fulfilments of the Law of life through death, the death of the lower principle preparing for the life of the higher. "Denying oneself" is expressed by "hating the soul in this world"; "taking up the cross" (on the supposition that "cross" means "the yoke of service") is expressed by "ministering unto me." "Following" Jesus is partially defined—or at all events partially explained as being metaphorical not literal—by the context, which adds "where I am, there shall my minister be." But the Evangelist reserves a further doctrine about "following Jesus" for the conclusion of his Gospel. There we are shewn how the beloved disciple and Peter, each

¹ Jn xv. 20, xvi. 2, 33.

² Jn xii. 23—6.

510 (Mark viii. 34—ix. 1)

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

in his appointed path, may "follow" Jesus. Peter follows literally, on the path of the cross; the beloved disciple not literally, but spiritually—"following" and yet perhaps "tarrying" till the coming of the Lord¹.

§ 12. "*For my sake and the gospel's*," in Mark²

Matthew and Luke omit "*and the gospel's*," and the omission gives force to the language if it is to be regarded as an expression of personal loyalty. But it should be noted that in the later context, Mark has "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me *and of my words*" (not "of me" alone); and there, though Matthew deviates, Luke exactly follows Mark. Also, in Mark here, several authorities have "*for the sake of the gospel, or my gospel*" (without "*for my sake*")³. Origen, too, has "*for the sake of the gospel*" (without "*for my sake*") in a passage where he expressly quotes Mark by name at full length after quoting

¹ Jn xxi. 19—23.

² Mk viii. 35 W.H. txt *ἕνεκεν* [ἐμοῦ καὶ] τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Several authorities omit either *ἐμοῦ καὶ* or *καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*. SS has "because of my gospel." In martyrological phrases variations might be expected to spring up in the days when martyrdom was common. For example, in a comment on Mt. v. 10 "Blessed are they that have been persecuted for the sake of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," Clem. Alex. 581—2 first (1) quotes rightly except that he substitutes "shall be called sons of God" for "theirs is the kingdom of heaven," μακάριοι οἱ διωγμένοι ἕνεκεν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται. Then he adds (2, *ὡς τινες τῶν μετατιθέντων τὰ εὐαγγέλια*) as variants, (2) διωγμένοι ὑπὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, "persecuted [or (?) pursued, and taken] by righteousness" (comp. Phil. iii. 12) "*for they shall be perfect*," and (3) "persecuted on account of me, for they shall have a place where they shall not be persecuted." In Hermas, the endurance of persecution is freq. expressed by "suffer (πάσχω)" "on account of (ἕνεκα, διὰ, ὑπὲρ)" "the Name (ὄνομα)"—used absolutely or with "of the Lord," "of the Son of God" etc. (See Resch. *Paralleltexte* on Mt. v. 10.) Perhaps there would be a tendency to drop the use of "*gospel*" in such phrases as these, where it has a quasi-personification, when the word came to be generally used to mean "*a written Gospel*."

³ D and the best Latin MSS om. "me."

³ 511 (Mark viii. 34—ix. 1)

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

Matthew and Luke¹. This, then, is a case that perhaps calls for Johannine Intervention. That is to say, we might expect to find somewhere in John a distinction drawn between Jesus Himself, and—not indeed “the gospel,” a word that John never uses, but—the message of the Gospel, the essence and spirit of its vivifying and cleansing truth.

One aspect of such a distinction will be found immediately before the Washing of Feet, and a little after the exposition of the service of “ministering” as being the means of “keeping” the soul. It contains the last words of Christ’s public doctrine: “If any man hear *my sayings* and keep them not, I (*emph.*) judge him not. . . *the word* that I spake—that will judge him in the last day².” But a much more important aspect is that presented to us in the Johannine “Paraclete.” This does indeed convict the world, but has for its main work the guidance and strengthening of the disciples, dwelling in their hearts as Christ’s Other Self. John helps us to feel—though he does not expressly say—that as we can “grieve” this holy Spirit³ and “rebel” against it, so also we can be, and should be, loyal to it and willing to “lose life” for its sake.

§ 13. “*For what could a man give in exchange for his soul?*” in Mark and Matthew⁴

The fact that Luke omits these words obliges us to ask whether there is any Johannine equivalent. But we have first to ask their precise meaning and Luke’s (possible or probable) reasons for omitting them.

The Marcan word for “a thing given in exchange” is used by Euripides, “The crowd is an absurd *substitute* for the sterling friend,” and Ben Sira (LXX), “There is no *substitute* for a

¹ Origen *Exhort. ad Mart.* § 12.

² Jn xii. 47—8.

³ Comp. Is. lxiii. 9—10 “In all their affliction he was afflicted. . . . But they rebelled, and grieved his holy spirit.”

⁴ Mk viii. 37, Mt. xvi. 26 ἀντάλλαγμα.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

disciplined soul¹." It is the "equivalent," in money or kind, given in exchange for anything². "If a man has lost his soul, has he another soul to give to the captor as an equivalent so as to buy it back again?"—this question Chrysostom finds in Matthew and answers with a negative³. Origen puts the case rather differently: "But having once for all lost his own soul . . . a man will not be able to give an *equivalent* for the soul that is perishing (*lit.* in the condition of being lost). For the [soul] fashioned according to the image of God is more precious than all things. There is only One who has been able to give an *equivalent* for our formerly *perishing* soul—He that bought us with His own precious blood⁴." This gives to Mark's word a meaning that approaches "ransom," and a form of the word is used in a parallel to "ransom" in the Epistle to Diognetus⁵.

Thus interpreted, Mark's words contain a warning against the attractive yoke of Mammon, the ruler of this world—that selfish greediness which Paul calls idolatry⁶. If a man sells his soul to this Master, how will he buy it back again? What is the price, equivalent and effectual for such a purpose?⁷

¹ Eurip. *Orest.* 1156—7 ἀλόγιστον δὲ τι τὸ πλῆθος ἀντάλλαγμα γενναίου φίλου, where τι seems to apologize ("so to speak") for the strangeness of the epithet, which perhaps plays on two meanings, (1) "not worth reckoning," (2) "absurd" (but ? ἀλικοστόν or ἀλίγοστον); Sir. xxvi. 14 οὐκ ἔστιν ἀντάλλαγμα πεπαιδευμένης ψυχῆς.

² See *Oxf. Conc.* ἄλλαγμα and ἀντάλλαγμα, to which add that in Sir. xlv. 17 ἀντάλλαγμα = ἡ ἀλήθεια.

³ Chrys. on Mt. xvi. 26 *ed.* Field vol. ii. p. 126.

⁴ Origen *Exhort. ad Mart.* § 12 ἀπαξ δὲ ἀπολίσσας τις τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν, ἢ ζημιωθείς αὐτήν, κἀν τὸν ὄλον κερδήσῃ κόσμον, οὐ δυνήσεται αὐτὸν δοῦναι ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ἀπολλυμένης ψυχῆς. 'Ἡ γὰρ κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ δεδομουργημένη, τιμητίρα ἐστὶ πάντων. Εἰς μόνος δεδύνηται δοῦναι ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ἀπολλυμένης πρότερον ψυχῆς ἡμῶν, ὃ ὠνησάμενος ἡμᾶς τῷ ἑαυτοῦ τιμῇ αἵματι (1 Pet. i. 19).

⁵ *Epist. ad Diognet.* ix. 2—5 Αὐτὸς τὸν ἴδιον υἱὸν ἀπέδοτο λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν...ὃ τῆς γλυκείας ἀνταλλαγῆς.

⁶ Coloss. iii. 5.

⁷ Comp. Rom. vii. 14—24 "But I am a creature of flesh (σάρκινος) sold under sin...who shall deliver me out of this body of death?"

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

If we ask why Luke omitted the words, a partial answer may be found in the obscurity of the context in Mark and Matthew, where they speak of "*being mulcted in his own soul*".¹ It may not have seemed clear to Luke that "*soul*" here meant "*soul in the higher sense.*" Luke at all events substitutes "*himself,*" meaning "*his true self,*" and adds "*having lost (or, destroyed)*" to "*being mulcted,*" in order to keep up the connection with what precedes ("*losing the soul*") and also to shew the active culpability of the "*loser (or, destroyer).*" Luke may also have had some other motive. For elsewhere, in a parallel to a Mark-and-Matthew tradition that Jesus "*came to give his soul as a ransom for many*",² Luke omits these words. Now we have seen above, from Origen, that the Marcan phrase "*in exchange*" naturally suggests thoughts about "*ransom of the soul.*" Perhaps Luke may have argued that there was some inconsistency (at all events on the surface) in two traditions one of which said, in effect, that there was *no* ransom, and another, that there *was* a ransom. More probably Luke declined to record doctrine about so deep a subject in language so brief as to leave loop-holes for errors or perversions³.

¹ Mk viii. 36 ζημιωθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, Mt. xvi. 26 τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῆ, Lk. ix. 25 ταυτὸν δὲ ἀπολείσας ἡ ζημιωθείς. Comp. Philo ii. 649 μείζον ἀνθρώπου κακὸν ἀφροσύνης οὐδὲν ἐστὶ. . . τὸν νοῦν ζημιωθέντι.

² Mk x. 45, Mt. xx. 28. Luke, in his introduction to this narrative, mentions vaguely (xxii. 24) "*a contention among them*" where Mark and Matthew mention severally "*indignation*" concerning "*James and John*" or "*the two brothers.*" Then he (*ib.* 25—6) at first follows Mk-Mt. as to Christ's words. But he breaks away (*ib.* 27) at their conclusion. No doubt Luke followed, and did not invent, a different version of the narrative. But that need not have prevented him from inserting such an important saying as that about "*ransom,*" in some other part of his Gospel—if he believed that it was uttered on some occasion, though not on the one described by Mark.

³ Jerome, on Mt. xvi. 26, says that the "*equivalent (commutatio)*" for Israel is (Is. xliii. 3) Egypt and Ethiopia; but, for man's soul, "*Illa sola est retributio quam Psalmista canit. 'Quid retribuam...? Calicem salutis accipiam (Ps. cxvi. 12—13)...'*" Jerome's comment

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

John, although he nowhere mentions "ransom" or "equivalent," brings the thought before his readers in several ways. First, he represents Jesus as Himself saying "Whence shall we *buy* bread that these may eat?"—mystically implying that Christ "*buys*" life for His disciples¹. Secondly, in the Good Shepherd, he shews us Jesus "laying down life" for the sheep in conflict with the wolf—which implies ransom in a certain sense, and yet no compromise, but victory over the enemy². Also, John repeatedly represents the disciples as being "in" the Son, so that they must share in His sufferings and in His glory. In his Gospel, Jesus does not indeed expressly say, with Pauline metaphor, "I am the body of which you are the limbs, so that I take your imperfect life into myself and give you my life in its place as the *equivalent*"; but He does express the Johannine aspect of this truth when He says "*I am the vine, ye are the branches*"³."

§ 14. "*In this adulterous...generation,*" in Mark⁴

Luke omits these words, probably for the same reason for which he omits "adulterous" elsewhere⁵, namely, that

on the Psalm says "*calicem passionis martyrium esse,*" quoting "Pater, si possibile est, transeat iste *calix* a me."

As an instance of difficulties attending the use of "equivalent," see Sir. xliv. 17 "In a season of destruction he [*i.e.* Noah] became the *equivalent*, or *successor* (εὐχρηστὴ) (*ἀντὶἀλλαγῆς*)"—*i.e.* he became the substitute, successor, representative, and remnant, of perished humanity—where Syr. has (Walton) "mundi vicarius (καὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐκπληροῦν)." "

¹ Jn vi. 5. See Chapter VIII. § 18.

² Jn x. 15—18.

³ Jn xv. 5.

⁴ Mk viii. 38, om. in parall. Lk. ix. 26. The parall. Mt. xvi. 27 paraphrases the whole sentence.

⁵ Mk viii. 12

Why doth this generation seek a sign? verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this generation.

Mt. xvi. 4 (rep.
xii. 39)

An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of Jonah.

Lk. xi. 29

This generation is an evil generation: it seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

"adulterous" might be misunderstood by Greeks in such a context. "Adulterous," in the Prophets, meant that the generation was unfaithful to Jehovah and followed after false gods. Jesus declared that "this generation" had, as Jeremiah says, "broken the yoke" of the Lord, the yoke of freedom and wedlock¹. They had gone back to the yoke of slavery to the flesh, the yoke of Egypt, concerning which the Lord had said to Israel "I am the Lord your God, who brought you forth out of the land of Egypt...and I have *broken the bars of your yoke* and made you go upright²."

John does not use the word "adulterous," but he takes pains to shew Greek readers the meaning of the term in a dialogue bearing on freedom. In reply to Christ's promise to make them "free" the Jews say "We be Abraham's seed and have never yet been in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, 'Ye shall be made free'?" Hereon Jesus shews them that a man may be "the bondservant of sin." Afterwards He contrasts their conduct in seeking to kill Him with that of Abraham, as shewing that they are not truly Abraham's children or God's children. The Jews protest "We were not *born of fornication*; we have one Father, [even] God." Jesus replies, "If God were your Father, ye would love me," and finally says "Ye are of [your] father the devil³."

"Abraham" comes in again when Jesus says that the first of the Fathers of Israel exulted in the vision of His "day⁴." The "day"—as is shewn by the whole dialogue—means the triumph of humanity over inhumanity. That means a reign

¹ Jerem. v. 5. The context indicates spiritual as well as literal adultery.

² Lev. xxvi. 13. It might be objected that "going upright" is incompatible with the bearing of *any* "yoke," even that of the Lord. But that is not the view taken by the Hebrew prophets of that service of the Lord which is perfect freedom. In Jerem. v. 5, "broken the yoke" is paraphrased by the Targumist "revolted from the Law." Comp. Jas. i. 25 "the law of liberty."

³ Jn viii. 32—44.

⁴ Jn viii. 56.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

of filial and brotherly love. Such a triumph also implies the supersession of constrained obedience to Law by willing obedience to a Father's will. That is "freedom."

In *Johannine Grammar*¹ it was maintained that "man" is emphatic in the sentence "Ye seek to kill me, a *man*, [one] that told you the truth." The foregoing considerations rather favour that view. They indicate that Jesus regarded Himself as "man," or "son of man," standing up for humanity against inhumanity or non-humanity; and they explain the importance Jesus attached to the personality of Abraham, as being the harbinger or promise of that Spirit of Humanity which He felt to be identified with Himself, and which was to result in the triumph of the Son of Man at the right hand of the Father².

The Law said "Honour thy father." Jesus, in the Fourth Gospel, calling Himself Son of Man, is regarded mystically as the Son of divine Humanity, the eternal, and only begotten Son of that God who has revealed Himself as Father to mankind, whom He created in His own image and destined to be conformed to His own likeness. Believing that God Himself was, in the highest sense of the word, *humane*, and that humanity (rather than power or wisdom) was His most divine attribute, Jesus felt that in honouring human beings—provided that they were *humane*, even though very degraded specimens of humanity—He was honouring the Father. This the Pharisees could not understand because they did not understand man's divine nature. They attempted to exalt God ("give glory to God") by lowering His Son, "this man" ("we know that *this man* is a sinner³")—an attempt that Jesus had previously described in the words "I honour my Father and ye dishonour me⁴." It is not for nothing that Jesus, speaking of the evidence resulting from the combined action of the Father and the Son, illustrates it by saying "The testimony of *two human-beings* is true. I am he

¹ *Joh. Gr.* 2412 a.

² See *Son* 3216 d—f.

³ *Jn* ix. 24 "this man (*οὗτος ὁ ἀνθρώπος*)," emphatic.

⁴ *Jn* viii. 49.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

that beareth witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me¹." The great fault of the Jewish "rulers" and scribes in Christ's time was that they were not humane, and their study of the Law merely hardened their inhumanity.

§ 15. "*With the angels that are holy,*" in Mark²

This passage has been previously discussed, and the following conclusions have been reached³. Mark's original had "*with the holy ones*" or "*saints*," that is, as the Epistle to the Hebrews says, "the spirits of righteous men made perfect⁴." This was taken by Mark to mean "*angels*," and he conflated it in the phrase, "*the angels that are holy*," meaning emphatically the angels that are of light, not of darkness⁵. Matthew expressed the same thing in the phrase "with his [i.e. God's] *angels*." Luke adopted Mark's conflation, but with a slight alteration so as to take away the emphasis that suggested contrast. He has, not "*the angels that are holy*," but simply "*the holy angels*" (a title of respect rather than of distinctive definition). The Revised Version (see p. 502) conceals this difference.

These conclusions were supported by collections of facts bearing on the Biblical use of the terms "holy [ones]" and

¹ Jn viii. 17—18. See *Son* 3450 a on the emphasis created by inserting *ἄνθρωποι*, not meaning "men of special distinction (*ἄνδρες*)," but "human beings." "Men" is not in the Hebrew or the Greek of the original (Deut. xvii. 6, comp. Deut. xix. 15).

² Mk viii. 38, comp. Mt. xvi. 27, Lk. ix. 26. ³ *Son* 3220 foll.

⁴ See Heb. xii. 22—4, which mentions, in the following order, (1) "Mount Zion and the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," (2) "the full assembly of myriads of angels," (3) "the Church of the firstborn that are enrolled in the heavens," (4) "God the Judge of all," (5) "*the spirits of righteous [men] who have been perfected* (*πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελειωμένων*)," (6) "Jesus the mediator of a new covenant," (7) "the blood of sprinkling...." It would seem that some of these categories might overlap one another.

⁵ On the rareness of the reduplicated article (*τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων*) in the Synoptists, except in a few special phrases, see *Joh. Gr.* 1983. In Barnabas, the only instance of "*angels*" pl. is § 18 "*angels of God...angels of Satan*."

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

"angels." It was also pointed out that Paul regarded the "holy ones," or "saints," as destined to be assessors with Christ in the Last Judgment. In that assessorship saints seem more appropriate than angels. Those who accept the Incarnation will recognise the reasonableness of the Christian belief that the Son assumed flesh in order that He might be subjected to the temptations of the flesh, and thus might be fitted to judge men as well as to help them. The same thing is true of saints. But it is not true of angels if they are regarded as beings that have never been tempted.

The Fourth Gospel, at all events, implies that judgment was committed to the Son of Man *because He was "the Son of Man,"* and therefore able to sympathize with, and make allowance for, men's infirmities¹. Unless therefore Mark's original here mentioned "holy ones," there would seem to be an omission of something, if not essential, at all events contributive to the fairness and fulness of any judgment implied in the coming of the Son of Man. But on the other hand if Mark's original spoke of the Son as coming "in glory" and "with holy ones," then we see how this prepares for the mention (in the next verse) of a foretaste of the "coming" for some "standing here," who "shall not taste death till they see the kingdom of God having come in power." This foretaste all the Synoptists appear to discern in the Transfiguration. And here Jesus appeared in glory with Moses and Elijah, who are called by Luke emphatically "two *men* (*viri*)"—as being the fit representatives of the preparatory testimony of Israel, testifying to the One God through the Law and the Prophets².

¹ Jn v. 22—7.

² Mk ix. 4, Mt. xvii. 3. In Lk. ix. 30 *ἄνδρες δύο* suggests the question whether we are to contrast it with the *δύο ἄνθρωποι*, above (pp. 517—18) mentioned in Jn. Is Luke, as well as John, thinking of the Law of Evidence in Deut. xvii. 6 (xix. 15) "at the mouth of two witnesses"? If so, we must suppose that the two Evangelists regard the "witnesses" from different points of view. Luke regards them as *ἄνδρες*, "men of repute, famous and credible"; John regards

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

According to Matthew, Jesus spoke about "the angels of the little ones in heaven" as always beholding the face of the Father¹. According to all the Synoptists, Jesus said that the righteous, in the Resurrection, are "*as angels in the heavens*," or are "*fellows-with-angels*," and "*sons of God*," being "*sons of the resurrection*"². Language like this points, not to such conceptions as Michael or Raphael, but to what we may call human angels, "the spirits of righteous men made perfect"³. And these appear to be contemplated here in the Marcan tradition about the coming of the Son of Man⁴.

What, if any, is the Johannine equivalent of an assessorship of "saints," taking part in the judgment pronounced by the Son of Man on the sinful world? It is difficult to answer without appearing to be fanciful—so completely does the Fourth Gospel depart from the popular conception of a judge sitting in judgment. We cannot say that John departs from Mark, for Mark never mentions the word "judge"—nor "judgment" either, except as to the abundant "judgment," or "condemnation," which will be received by the Pharisees⁵. But we can

them as "human beings," i.e. types or images of the divine Nature in the likeness of which God created man.

¹ Mt. xviii. 10.

² Mk xii. 25, Mt. xxii. 30 *ὡς ἄγγελοι*, but Lk. xx. 36 *ἰσάγγελοι* . . . *καὶ υἱοὶ εἰσὶν θεοῦ, τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες*.

³ Heb. xii. 23.

⁴ To the facts collected in *Son* 3220 foll. add that Clem. Rom. frequently mentions "angels" in the pl., but mostly in quotations from O.T. or from the Epistle to the Hebrews. On one occasion (§ 39) he mentions "*holy angels*," quoting from LXX of Job v. 1 "To which of the *holy ones* (or, *saints*) wilt thou turn?" but LXX εἴ τινα ἀγγέλων ἁγίων ὄψῃ (v.r. ἁγίων ἀγγέλων, and so Clem. ἁγίων ἀγγέλων). Here we find, in fact, all that was put forward (in the above-mentioned four conjectures) about Mk viii. 38: 1st, the original has "*holy ones*"; 2nd, this was taken to mean "*angels*"; 3rd, it was conflated as "*holy angels*," a phrase occurring nowhere (*Son* 3219) in O.T.; 4th, the MSS vary, as Mk and Lk. vary, in the order of "*holy*" and "*angels*."

⁵ Mk xii. 40.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

say that John departs from the tradition of Matthew and Luke that the Twelve shall "sit on thrones judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel¹." Nowhere does the Fourth Gospel verbally favour such an exaltation of the Twelve, or of any human beings, into a position of judicial authority.

Yet, if we look beneath the words to the thoughts, we shall find that John does imply, or assume, in his conception of the judgment of the world, some co-operation of Christ's disciples with Christ Himself, such as might be represented in a picture by "assessors." For in the Fourth Gospel "judgment" means a *crisis*, or *division*, of the children of light from the children of darkness, a *crisis* caused by an effluence from the Light that attracts the former and repels the latter².

Through what channel, or by what instrumentality, is this effluence to go forth? Jesus says "I came not to judge the world... *the word that I spake shall judge*³." But is "the word" merely the doctrine uttered by Jesus and committed to writing by the Evangelists? Is it not also the expression of that doctrine in the words and deeds of all the faithful followers of Jesus, in all generations so far as they live as the children of light, and put to shame, and convict, the works of darkness? These therefore, the children of light, may be called—and indeed must be called—producers of the *crisis*, or *division*, or, in another metaphor, "assessors in judgment."

The same thing is implied in the Johannine doctrine of "conviction (*elenchos*)."⁴ It means the judgment pronounced on oneself by one's own conscience: "Every one that doeth evil hateth the light and cometh not to the light lest his deeds

¹ Mt. xix. 28, Lk. xxii. 30.

² Jn iii. 16—21.

³ Jn xii. 48. Comp. viii. 50 *ἵσται δὲ ἡγῶν καὶ κρίνων*, "There is he that seeketh and judgeth." Yet (v. 22) "the Father judgeth no man." Who is it then that judges? It is the Word, or Spirit, of justice. Though the Son did not "*come to judge*," He cannot help *judging*, any more than a lamp can avoid revealing that which, until the light came, lay hid in darkness.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

should be convicted," and "When he [*i.e.* the Spirit or Paraclete] is come, *he will convict* the world¹." But through what channel was the Spirit to go forth to the world? It would seem to be those disciples to whom Jesus said "Receive ye the Holy Spirit. Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever [sins] ye retain, they are retained²." This was, in effect, an imparting of authority to "judge"; it constituted what might be represented in a picture as "assessorship."

§ 16. "When he cometh in the glory of his Father"

This is Mark's first mention of a future "coming" of the Son of Man. As it is mentioned also in the parallel Matthew and Luke, and as Luke closely agrees with Mark, there is no reason why John should intervene, so far as this verse is concerned. But in the following verse, where Mark and Matthew speak of bystanders who shall "*see the kingdom of God having come in power,*" or "*see the Son of man coming in his kingdom,*" Luke omits "*come,*" thus: "till they see *the kingdom of God*³." The reason for the omission appears to be this. Luke regards the words as an introduction to the Transfiguration, which immediately follows. But this, he seems to say, though it was a revelation, giving the disciples a glimpse of "the kingdom of God," was not a "*coming*" of the Lord: "The two things must be kept distinct. The time will arrive when men 'will see the Son of Man *coming* in a cloud.' Predictions of this I shall insert in the Gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles⁴. That will be the day of judgment. But that is far distant."

According to Origen, however, the "*coming*" here mentioned as being "in the glory of the Father" is rather of the nature of a revelation than of a local "*coming down*" from heaven to

¹ Jn iii. 20, xvi. 8.

² Jn xx. 22—3.

³ Mk ix. 1 *τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυθῆσαν ἐν δυνάμει*, Mt. xvi. 28 *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ*, Lk. ix. 27 *τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*, all preceded by *ὥς ἂν ἴδωσιν*.

⁴ Lk. xxi. 27, comp. Acts i. 11.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

earth. This view accords with Jewish thought. In the Bible, when God says "*I will go down*"—as for example, to see the tower of Babel, or to see Israel in Egypt—the Targums render it by "*I will manifest myself*¹." So here, Origen says that the "*coming*" did not mean—or at all events did not mean merely—coming down from the clouds, or from one of the seven heavens, but coming into the heart. The vision, or feeling, of that "*coming*" must depend on the acceptance by the disciples of that spiritual preparation which has been offered to them by Jesus: "To the perfect He 'comes in the glory of His Father,' and they can say [with John the Evangelist] 'We beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth'.²"

John suggests a "*glory*" of this kind in his account of a Voice from Heaven—the only one mentioned in the Fourth Gospel. In answer to Christ's prayer "Father, *glorify thy name*," the Voice replied, "I have both glorified it and will *glorify it again*³." Jesus had previously said, "*The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified*⁴." The context speaks of judgment: "Now [*i.e.* in this moment] is there a *judgment of this world*, now [*i.e.* in this moment] shall the ruler of this world be cast out outside [*i.e.* utterly]; and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all [men] unto myself. But this he said, signifying by what kind of death he was destined to die⁵." The context also speaks of "*an angel*," but only perhaps in a kind of irony, along with "*thunder*"—as one of

¹ So Onkelos on Gen. xi. 5, 7, xviii. 21, Exod. iii. 8 etc. rendering יר "go down," by bithp. of הוה "reveal." And so Jer. Targ. in Gen. xviii. 21, Exod. iii. 8 etc.

² Origen, on Mt. xvi. 27 (Lomm. iii. 177—8), quoting Jn i. 14. See *Son* 3234.

³ Jn xii. 27—8.

⁴ Jn xii. 23.

⁵ Jn xii. 31—3 ἐκβαλεῖσθαι ἔγω. Without ἔγω, the verb might have suggested the "*casting out*" of an evil spirit, an action never mentioned by John.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

the *non-causes* which the materialistic multitude is always ready to substitute for a real and spiritual cause¹. •

Taken as a whole, this Johannine narrative seems to convey—besides its direct dramatization of the revelation of the Law of Self-sacrifice—a lesson about the “*coming*” of Christ as revealed in the Synoptic account of the Transfiguration. John suggests to us that we need not find difficulty in the old tradition which said about the three “pillar apostles,” Peter, James, and John, that they “should not taste death till they had seen the kingdom of God [having] come in power.” For they did, in effect, “see” it when the Son revealed to them the Law of Self-sacrifice as the Law of that Kingdom, and Himself as being at once the Sacrifice and the King. The multitude did not hear the Voice, but the beloved disciple heard it and recorded it. When Jesus said, “The hour hath come that the Son of man should be glorified,” it *had* “come.” And He, too, “came,” not from material clouds down to material earth, but from the bosom of God into the hearts of those who were ready to receive Him. That, or something like that, seems to be John’s meaning.

If we turn to the final Johannine mention of the “coming” of the Lord, we shall find that its doctrine is of the same kind—at first sight, indefinite, thin, and unsatisfying, but ultimately helpful. It is preceded by teaching that seems intended to force us to delocalise our conceptions of “coming.” Jesus has previously said, “Where I am, there shall also my minister be²,” and “If a man love me...my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him³.” That being the case, what need is there (we ask) of any future definite or local “coming” to the world at large? And yet such a coming is suggested toward the close of the Fourth Gospel in

¹ Jn xii. 29 “The multitude therefore that stood by and heard it [with their outward ears] said that it had thundered; others said, An angel hath spoken unto him.”

² Jn xii. 26.

³ Jn xiv. 23.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

Christ's words to Peter about the beloved disciple: "If I desire him to remain [or, wait] *while I am coming*, what is that to thee? Follow thou me¹."

If we are inclined to say "This is distracting," let us add "But perhaps it is purposely distracting." John does not set before us a picture—corresponding to that in the first chapter of the Acts—of the whole band of the disciples on the Mount of Olives, or of Peter as their representative, looking up from earth to heaven and "waiting" for the "coming" of the Lord from a visible cloud. He sets before us only two disciples—only two out of the little group of only seven. Both are described as "following" Jesus, or as bidden to "follow²." But concerning the one that follows, without being bidden to follow, Jesus says to the other, who follows because he is bidden to follow, "If I desire him to *remain* while I am coming, what is that to thee?"

In this sentence, it is little short of a disaster that our Revised Version renders "*while*" by "*till*³." The mistranslation prevents us from realising how the Evangelist knits together

¹ Jn xxi. 22. On *ἕως ἔρχομαι*, "*while I am coming*" (not "*till I come*"), see *Joh. Gr.* 2069. Two of the best Latin MSS (*a* and *e*) have "*dum venio*."

² Jn xxi. 19, 20 "*Follow me*... Peter seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved *following*."

³ Jn xxi. 22 *ἕως ἔρχομαι*, R.V. "*till I come*." There is no authority for such a rendering. There is also much against it—including a passage in the Fourth Gospel itself where Jesus says (Jn ix. 4), "We must work the works of him that sent me *while* it is day." R.V., however, gives "*till*" without alternative, and supports it by marginal references, not one of which is to the point. Indeed they are all inconsistent with R.V., since they shew that N.T. writers, when wishing to express "*until*" by *ἕως*, do not use it with the indicative. Westcott, after quoting A.V. "*tarry till I come*," says "The exact force of the original is rather '*while I am coming*' (*ἕως ἔρχομαι*). The '*coming*' is not regarded as a definite point in future time, but rather as a fact which is in slow and continuous realisation." *The comment is excellent except for the insertion of "rather."* "*On the contrary*" would have been preferable.

THE NEW LAW OF SACRIFICE

the beginning and the end of his Gospel in his use—a spiritual use—of this indefinite word “*coming*,” which he contrasts with the definite “*came*.” Near the beginning of his Prologue, after speaking of the Life that was “the light of men,” he says “There was a human being, sent from God, named John; he *came* to [be] a witness, that he might witness concerning the light.... He was not the light, but [*came*] that he might witness concerning the light. There was [from all eternity] the light that is the true light, which enlighteneth every human being [*by its continual*] *coming* into the world¹.” So now, at the end of the same Gospel, the incarnate Word, Life, Light, and Son, stands before us as if applying the title of the Coming One to Himself in order to still our impatient souls under the trial of waiting: “The beloved disciple ‘followed,’ and yet ‘waited.’ And how long the period of ‘waiting’ shall be is not revealed. Light, though it comes quickly and constantly, has never completed its coming. It will not burn out like a torch. A torch gives its light and dies. The Light gives its light and does not die. It gains by giving itself to whatever receives it. The Life, the Light, and the Son, are to be thought of as continually giving and as continually coming.”

¹ Jn i. 6—9.

INDICES

INDICES

	PAGE
I. SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES	529
II. ENGLISH	543
III. GREEK	570

INDEX

I. SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES

GENESIS

	PAGE
3	237
7	78
9	64
11	306
14	140
22	319
2 4 foll	306
3 8	433, 463
17-18	28
18-19	206
19	345
6 5	373
6	478
17-18	335
18	338-9
7 1	477
9 3	306
10 20	87
31	87
11 5	523
7	523
28	87
31	87
12 1	110
2	180, 319
13 16	351
14 20	164
16 1	387
3-8	287
5	464, 468
7	87
9-10	316
16 7	35, 461
8	270
10	351
13	296, 461
14	35, 296
17 2	326
4	323
18 2	326, 365
4	323
6	31, 373
7	363

GENESIS

	PAGE
18 8	333
14	139
21	523
28	378
21 22	503
22 1	285
3-5	265
4	238, 265
13	238
24 10	290
25 1	40
11	164
26 12	38, 287
12-13	38
17	537
27 40	33
28 11	63-4
12	16
18	63-4
20	257
29 4	370
11	290
31 18	263
32 10	159
34 29	349
37 15	360
40 13	90
19	90
20	90
41 56-7	272
42 25	239
43 8	349
25	232
28-9	251
30	251
45 21	239
46 21	97
48 15-16	356
16	333
49 11	301, 395
20	323
27	323-3
50 10	101

EXODUS

	PAGE
1 6-7	20
13	473
2 6	283-9
10	423
23	269
23-4	473
3 1	259
8	523
18	236, 265
4 10	470
11	470
27	280
5 1	338
3	265
6 15	468
7 16	238
8 20	238
27	236, 265
28	238
10 7	196
9	246
10	349
11	245, 249
12 1	293
10	340
37	245-6, 349-50
39	239
46	323, 340
13 2	296
18	313
14 29	304
15 22	265
16 4	203-5
13	204
14	204
19	203
27	236
19 7	233
11	267
15	267
17	30
20 2	259
8	394

INDEX

EXODUS

	PAGE
20 12	292
17	121
21 1	252
30	277
23 2	222
25	219
33	126
24 8	292
9-II	257
10	222
11	256
25 31	26
37	22
26 32	291
32-7	254
37	291
20 12	277
12-13	278
33 1	12
3	12
5	100
11	269, 291
38 26	250

LEVITICUS

2 13	221
4 3	172
5 7	99
7 12	219
10 8	257
10	442
11 3	222
37	45
12 2	490
13 2	52
2-24	465
14 9	115
18 6	26
12	26
13	26
19 14	126
21 14-15	7
18	470
25 5	22
11	22
49	222
26 8	292
13	216
26	159
27 8	99

NUMBERS

1 45-6	250
47	99

NUMBERS

	PAGE
2 32	250
3 14	269
4 3	211
7	222
47	211
7 6	216
48	222, 296
66 foll.	292
9 12	222
11 4-6	247
8	269
13	270, 275
21	245, 249-50
21-2	275
22	270-71, 224
14 30	247
16 26	17
35	211
17 1 foll.	250
18 19	221
21 17	222
30	22
24 3	144
26 2	250
27 16 foll.	255
17	256
28 3	277
32 17	212

DEUTERONOMY

1 5	225
6 4	8
7 13	219
15 21	470
17 2-6	120
6	512-19
19 15	155, 512-19
21 23	115
22 5	240
23 13	162
25 9	489
26 2-4	202, 242
3	209, 242-3
5-15	242
10	242
28 5	242-3
17	242-3
60	212
66	114
32 29	205
33 3	246
9	505
34 5	222

JOSHUA

	PAGE
1 14	212
4 12	212
6 5	29
9 6-16	226
11	212
13 6	222
23 13	126

JUDGES

2 3	126
7 11	212
8 27	126
14 12-19	4
15 19	100
16 26	257
19 7	222
8	222
9-II	222
30	202

RUTH

1 14	220
------	-----

I SAMUEL

2 25	120
9 13	212, 224
10 1	220
16 14	76
17 40	160, 170
43	161
45	161
18 21	126
19 13	62
14	222
21 3	202
4	442
24 3	72
25 31	126
26 12	62
18	271
19	221
30 12	100

2 SAMUEL

6 19	220
12 13	179
15 16-18	245
17 23	227
22 17	422
24 19-20	244

SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES

I KINGS

	PAGE
3 26	251
11 36	22
13 7	223
17 9	409, 445
12	220
18 4	210
19 5	217
6	217, 267
11	54
20 11	470

2 KINGS

4 42	275, 296, 292
43	297, 232, 232,
	240
44	232, 232, 240
5 10 foll.	464
6 27	270
9 13	218
16	99
19 29	22
20 1	237

I CHRONICLES

7 29	445
8 35	87
36	87
9 42	87
11 8	225
16 3	230
20 1	205
21 19-20	244

2 CHRONICLES

24 13	118
21	118
25 12	117

EZRA

8 17	403
9 8	163

NEHEMIAH

1 3	87
5 14	169
7 40	87

ESTHER

	PAGE
2 1	78
2	78
4 4	218
7 7	297

JOB

1 19	53
20	218
5 1	530
4	321
7 5	73
10 1	176
12 12	271
20 8	421
24 24	29
28 12-19	272
29 4	15
30 8	124
32 7	257
33 6	403
37 21	425
40 24	126

PSALMS

1 4	20
8 2	471
12 7	477
13 3	185
17 15	279
18 16	423
26	505
19 1	140
8	425
12	180
23 1	258-9
4-5	180
25 14	15
32 5	179
9	471
35 2	182
19	21
36 5-9	24
9	25, 460-61
41 9	246
42 1	296
7	422
45 7	175
49 4	4
20	4
50 14	262
51 6-10	457
10	403
17	262

PSALMS

	PAGE
59 6	85
66 10	422
12	422, 422
68 11	20
69 22	196
72 16	234
17	232
73 10	294
76 3	162
77 2-10	176
78 1	7, 8
2	4, 8, 48
14-37	250
15	232
19	232
20	247
24	239
25	239
52	250
70-72	7, 250
72	256
79 11	472
80 1	258
5	179
82 6	21
88 7	422
91 4	162
12	122
102 20	472
104 8-9	64
27	224, 227
105 16	159
21	251
106 20	204
36	126
107 2-5	264
17-19	424
20	20-21
30	242-3, 442,
	474
110 3-4	44
116 12-13	514
119 157	502
161-5	504
165	126, 120
126 5	29
128 1-2	22
140 7	221
141 4	221
145 15	227
16	256

PROVERBS

1 14	440
3 11	176

INDEX

PROVERBS

	PAGE
3 28	305
32	15
4 21	480
5 4	371
6 2	127
10 21	257
11 17	36
13 8	378
14	440-81
14 6	371
27	440-81
15 23	237
16 7	503
15	356, 363
21 4	33
9	449
25 24	449
27 1	304
16	188
25	304
31 20	336

ECCLESIASTES

4 9	157
12	157
11 5-6	40

SONG OF SONGS

2 1-2	30
16	259-80
5 12	239
13	298
7 1	168
8 1	133

ISAIAH

1 22	173, 297
3 2-3	310
3	311
5	124, 126
17	433
4 4	233
5 2	14
4	14
11	185
12	486
22	185
6 6	317, 358
10	5, 432, 461
10-11	8
11 1	355

ISAIAH

	PAGE
11 5	174
12	364
12 1	330
14 19	73
15 6	304
18 2	74
22 23	163
24 9	185
25 3	230
26 17-19	44
19	30
28 7	185, 481
12	230
29 9-10	185
11	462
12	462
13	462
18	462
30 17	263
33 21	245
35 1-7	470
3	469
4	78, 471
5-6	469
6	264
10	473
37 14	336
30	39
38 1	337
11	466
19	320
40 1	78
2	78
6-8	303
11	258, 263
41 27	78
42 6	339
43 3	514
45 15	5
49 1	30
2	30
3-4	5
8	269
51 4	259
12	78
18	78
52 7	168, 503
13-15	500
14 foll.	124
53 1-8	500
2-3	126
3	134-6, 426
4	232, 443, 499
10	426
11	27, 232
12	232, 500
54 1	409

ISAIAH

	PAGE
54 11	78
55 1	214, 273, 248
9-11	17
10	35
56 6	336
57 17	5
19	265
58 7	332-4
10	361, 376, 467
59 15-17	144
16	144
21	391
61 1	465
11	45
63 5	144
9	473
9-10	512
17	5
64 8	463
66 8	253

JEREMIAH

2 2	288
13	400-61
3 4	29
4 3	22
5 1	243
5	516
13	30
6 4	262
9	209
16	230
12 5	245
13 18	64
16 7	332-4
24 6	440
31 31-3	391
46 16	110
50 44	87
51 39	185

LAMENTATIONS

1 1	87
5	131
2 19	243
3 7	173
27-8	508
41	375
4 4	264, 322-4

EZEKIEL

3 20	181
------	-----

SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES

EZEKIEL

	PAGE
13 10	504
18	54
18-20	54
14 3	131
16 9	222
10	168
15	122
26	122
17 7	290
10	290
19 12	321
20 49	5, 198
21 5-6	472
22 18	172
26	448
27 8	245
26	245
34 2	272
15	207
16	207
18	202
38 2	97
3	95
39 1	95
42 20	440
44 23	448

DANIEL

1 12	45
16	45
4 19	244
25-33	204
27	200
5 25	224
28	224
9 13	125
25	125
11 14	125
19	125
33	125
35	125, 127, 120
41	125-8
12 2	72
4	220-21, 484

HOSEA

4 16	258
18	297
6 1-2	400
2	266, 326
6	262
7 4	270
11 7	114

JOEL

	PAGE
1 20	228

AMOS

8 11-12	220
12	220-21

JONAH

1 4	52
13	245

NAHUM

3 7	270
-----	-----

ZECHARIAH

2 4	280
9 7	75
10	220
10 4	162
12 5	75
6	75
13 7	252, 400

MATTHEW

2 18	78
3 10	282
11	167
4 5	56
6	122
8	56
13	152
23	152
24	192
5 4	78
6	207
8	455
10	502, 511
11	504
13	272
14	22
14-16	28 foll.
15	22
16-17	22
17	452
6 1	279
11	202
19-22	22
20	171, 279

MATTHEW

	PAGE
6 21	22
22 foll.	450
22-3	22
24	507
30	202, 205
33	20
7 2	28 foll.
5	485
9-11	225
11	27
22	256
23	505
27	122
8 2	140
6	422
10	148
11	220, 258
16	261
17	222, 462
18	54 foll.
22	22
23-7	54 foll.
27	420
28	60-74
28-34	66 foll.
31	79
32	76
33	81
33-4	80
34	71, 20
9 1	125, 241
8	27
13	262
18	98
18-26	94 foll.
20	98
22	100
24	101
27	74
27 foll.	492
35	142 foll., 152-2, 252
36	154, 214, 2
37	154, 262
38	154
10 1	142 foll., 262
2	142, 155
5-6	151
5-15	146 foll.
6	155
9	170, 172
9-10	156
10	100
19-20	166
23	155
26	28 foll.
27-8	222

INDEX

MATTHEW			MATTHEW			MATTHEW		
		PAGE			PAGE			PAGE
10	33	505	14	3-12	185 foll.	15	17	453
11	1	80, 221		9	201		18	448
	2-24	221		12	217, 218		19	450
	5	408		12-14	216 foll.		20	448
	6	125, 504		13	218, 227,		21	408
	15	28 foll.			227 foll., 241,		21-8	484 foll.
	21	487			245 foll.		22	400, 488
	25	230, 491		14	184, 227,		27	237
	25-7	221			247 foll., 255,		29	80, 409, 488
	28	230			480		29-31	487 foll.
	28-9	219, 223		14 foll.	214		30	470
	28-30	221		15	215, 225,		30-31	498
	29	508			261 foll.		31	264
12	4	208		15-16	269-74		32	220, 263 foll.,
	7	263		16	273, 241, 255			267
	9	80		16-18	283 foll.		32-4	263 foll.
	22	468		17	290, 294 foll.		33	225, 260 foll.
	22-5	475		18	294 foll., 246		33-7	208
	39	477, 515		19	297, 303-8,		34	230
	48-50	200			315, 328 foll.,		35	297, 309
13	1-23	1 foll.			232, 240		36	515, 329 foll.
	3	8		20	306, 326, 329		37	326
	8	7, 18		21	246, 268, 309,		38	246, 314, 348
	10	10, 48			314, 344 foll.,		39	242, 409, 442,
	11	14-15, 48			348			474
	12	20 foll.		22	228, 240, 408,		16	1
	13	6			413		4	472, 477, 515
	15	488		22 foll.	425		4-5	410
	18-19	19		22-33	408 foll.		5	288
	21	124		23	238, 413		5-12	210 foll., 478
	22	127		23-4	423		6	371, 479
	23	7		24	244, 403, 418,		8	478
	23-4	31			421		9-10	208
	24	228		24-5	418		13	48, 408, 412,
	24-7	26 foll.		26	58, 420-30			467
	26	37		27	58		13-16	484 foll.
	30	37		28	404		16	413
	31	328		29	404		20-23	498 foll.
	31-2	41 foll.		29-31	425		23	130, 501
	33	30-31, 370-72		30	53		24	204, 502
	34	20		31	421		24-8	501 foll.
	34-5	45 foll.		32	404		25	501
	35	4, 46		33	248, 429-30,		26	179, 512-14
	44	20			423, 440		27	515, 518, 523
	51	45		34	241, 244, 408,		28	523
	53-4	111			414		17	3
	53-8	107 foll.		34-6	442-4		12	135
	54	109-11, 119		35	243		15	469
	55	120, 128		36	79, 178		17	296
	55-7	112		15	1-20		17-20	42
	56	111, 124		2	447-8		18	469
	57	109, 124,		7	452		20	80
		133-4		8 foll.	462		24-7	280
	58	110, 127		10	452		18	6
14	1	193, 201		11	412, 448, 450			53, 124
	1-2	190 foll.		12	411, 412		8 foll.	127
	2	191, 198		15	12		10	255, 520
							12	224, 254 foll.

SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES

MATTHEW

	PAGE
18 16	156
19-20	157
19 19	379
25	114
26	129
28	356, 531
20 2-13	375
15	459
28	331, 514
30	468
34	465
21 14	466
15-16	114
16	471
42	191
22 18 foll.	377
30	530
37	8
23 16	461
25-6	455-8
26	361, 455
24 11-12	106
24	143
38	345
43	480
26 26	316
28	331, 335-8
29	304-5
31	127, 129, 252,
	499
38	427
41	127, 272
53	77
56	146-7
60	74
27 27	56
51-3	73
52-3	70

MARK

1 15	160
22	113
25	53
32	361
38	153, 487
39	153-3
40	140
41	247
45	199
2 1	128
2	21
12	27
26	263
3 5	479, 481
6	479

MARK

	PAGE
3 7-8	381
9	241
13-14	148
14	217
20-23	475
24	333
33-5	380
4 1-20	1-27 <i>passim</i>
1-34	1-51 <i>passim</i>
2	11, 199
2-3	8
3	8 foll.
8	7, 18
10	10-14, 48
11	5, 14 foll.
12	6
13-14	19-21
17	124, 129
19	127, 131
20	7
21	31-4
21-5	26-36
22	27 foll.
25	27
26-9	26-41
27	36 foll.
28	36 foll., 287,
	306
29	29
30-32	41-4
31	41-2
32	41-2
33	20
33-4	45-51
34	45-8
35	241
35-41	52-65 <i>passim</i>
36	55 foll.,
	60 foll.
38	62 foll.
39	53
41	480
5 1	71-8
1-20	66-83 <i>passim</i>
2	66, 81
3	66, 81, 83
4	82-4
5	69, 73, 81-4
10	79, 83, 86-9,
	199
10-23	78
12	79
13	74, 78
14	80-81, 420
15	83
16	81
17	71, 79-82

MARK

	PAGE
5 18	79
19	81, 85
21	241
21-43	94-106 <i>passim</i>
22	87
23	79, 99, 178
25	98
26	99
34	99, 109, 176,
	503
41	98
42	98-9
43	98
6 1	109-11
1 foll.	122
1-6	107-47 <i>passim</i>
2	111, 113, 119
3	1, 120-24, 128
4	109-10,
	123-6
4-5	175
5	113, 137 foll.,
	135
6	143, 153-3,
	253
6-13	142-89 <i>passim</i>
7	155, 157
8	156-61,
	170 foll., 206
9	167
10	193
12-13	186
13	175, 182,
	184 foll., 193
14	193, 200, 201
14 foll.	197 foll.
14-16	190-94
15	181
16	181, 200
17	494
17-29	195-203
20	192, 219, 246
22	201
23	201
26	201
27	201
29	218
29-34	216-63 <i>passim</i>
29-41	203-408 <i>passim</i>
30	217-19
30-35	233
31	219 foll., 232,

INDEX

MARK		MARK		MARK	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
6 31	225 foll., 223-7	7 1-23	445-63 pas- sim	8 15	370, 479
31-4	226	2	446, 450	17	206, 478-83
32	219, 226, 227 foll., 241-3	3	446	19-20	206
33	226, 228, 245-7	4	446	20	482
33-4	243	6	452	22	79
34	184, 199, 214, 227, 247 foll., 253-8, 256-7, 262, 227, 256, 480	6 foll.	492	22 foll.	487, 492
35	225, 261 foll.	7	452	22-6	410, 412, 453-52
35-7	260-82	14	452	23	473, 483
36	215	15	412, 448	24	220, 465, 468
37	215, 274 foll., 255 foll.	17	12, 411-12	25	484-6
37-8	223-26	19	452	26	487
38	284, 294 foll.	20	448	27	48, 408, 412, 487, 494
39	296 foll., 202 foll.	22	459	27-9	494-7
39-40	297-314	23	448	29	412
40	296, 299, 309-14	24	408, 411, 465, 468	30-33	496-501
41	215 foll., 221 foll., 228-9, 232	24-30	484-8	33	180, 501
42	206	26	409, 466	34	204, 502
42-3	226-43	27	206	34-9	501-26
43	226, 229	28	227	34-8	501-26
44	246, 269, 275, 209, 244 foll., 246 foll.	31	409, 467-8	35	511
45	228, 240, 408, 418-17	31-7	467-74	36	514
45-52	408-41 pas- sim	32	79, 264, 468	37	512-17
46	418-17	33	478	38	515-22
47	228, 261, 418-19	33-6	411	9 1	502 foll., 522
48	227, 244, 418 foll., 421 foll., 424	34	226	2	55
49	58, 429-32	37	114, 264	4	519
49-50	429	8 1 foll.	243	12	125
50	58	1-3	263-8	17	469
51	438	1-9	208, 474	19	296
52	206, 248, 428-41, 480	2	263 foll.	22 foll.	487
53	241, 243, 408, 414, 442, 474	2-5	223-26	23	123
53-6	442-4	3	220, 262 foll.	25	469
54	428, 420	4	225, 269, 271, 294-5	26	199, 469
54-5	243	4-8	206	42	124
56	79, 243, 448	5	223	43 foll.	127
7 1	218, 411	6	297, 229	49	221
		6-7	215 foll., 222, 229	49-50	273
		7	218, 229-30	50	199, 503
		8	226 foll., 229, 482	10 2	248
		9	248 foll.	12	248
		10	242, 409, 442, 474	21	279
		10-11	411	26	114
		10-12	474-7	27	129
		11	474	32	55
		12	472-4, 515	42	422
		12-13	477	45	221-2, 277, 514
		13-14	410	46	405, 498
		14	292	51	220
		14-21	208, 210 foll., 478	52	465, 494
		14-16	479	11 18	114
				12 4	125
				16 foll.	277
				18-27	128
				25	520

SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES

[illegible]

INDEX

LUKE		PAGE
9	51-3	406
	57	406
	60	83
	61	417
10	1	155
	1-2	154
	4	148, 170-71
	7	80
	13	487
	13 foll.	221
	18	91
	19	231
	21	220, 401
	27	8
	33	248
	40	377
11	3	208
	11-13	225
	13	27
	14-17	475
	16	474
	29	473, 477, 515
	32-4	23
	33	34
	34	450
	34-6	23
	37	222
	38	450
	39-41	361, 455-8
	40-41	455
12	1	210 foll., 222,
		479
	3-4	222
	9	505
	28	303
	31	28 foll.
	32	255
	33	171, 279
	38	480
	41	480
13	1	406
	11	470
	13	470
	15	373
	16	84, 470
	18-19	41 foll.
	19	44
	20	371
	21	30, 370-71
	22	148, 152-3,
		253
	26	258
	27	505
	29	230, 258
	31	406, 465
	32-3	266
	33	406

LUKE		PAGE
14	12	222
	33	417
	34	373
	35	28 foll.
15	4	224, 254
	4-6	261
	7	255
	20	248
16	11	23
	13	507
	25	78
17	2	124
	27-8	345, 350
18	13	263
	26	114
	27	120
	35	403
	42	465
19	5	405
	41-4	478
	47-8	114
20	11	126
	24	277
	36	520
21	1	173, 405
	14-15	106
	18	108
	27	522
	28	108
22	3	251
	15	294
	16	294
	17	316-17, 295
	18	294
	19	298
	20	231, 265, 292
	21	292
	24	514
	25-6	514
	27	231-2, 277,
		514
	29	292
	29-30	258
	30	521
	31	127, 422, 425
	36	170
	39 foll.	252
	47	228
	53	146-7
23	11	126
24	16	422
	18	15
	27	15, 320
	29	261-2
	30	222
	30-35	222
	31	226

LUKE		PAGE
24	32	226
	37	22, 421-2
	37-8	58
	43	15
	45	226
	48	156

JOHN		PAGE
1	1	27
	6-9	526
	9	23
	11	56
	11-12	57
	12	26, 42
	14	27, 522
	14-17	120, 218
	14-18	24
	17	26
	18	27
	21	194
	23	40
	32-4	157
	39	202
	40	151
	41	406
	44	240
	46	221, 292
	51	406
2	5	277
	6	202, 460-61
	7	242
	9	277
	11	140
	13	212, 461
	19-21	268
	25	144
3	3	256
	3-8	9
	5	256
	6	40
	8	40
	10	10, 41
	12	146
	16	27, 242, 224
	16-21	521
	19-20	121
	20	522
	22	150, 192
	22 foll.	150
	24	202
	24-30	151
	25	400, 461
	26	191
	30	150, 194, 202
	31	194

SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES

JOHN	
	PAGE
3 31-6	202
35	204
4 I	198
1-2	180, 196
3	406
5	25
6	25
8	215, 274
11	25
12	25
14	25
17-18	122
19	401
20-24	401
23	22
29	401
32	274
35	25, 51, 228
36	199
37	21-7
38	40, 150
39	22
43-5	197
44	109, 125
45	109, 119, 125
46-54	122
47	406
48	146
53	98
54	406
5 2	240
13	122
18	262, 407
19	127, 140
22	221
22-7	519
24	80
25	9
26	222
28-9	99
30	127, 140
32-6	25
35	191, 194
36	140
42	224
44	144
6 I	241
1-5	217, 222
2	246-7, 475
2-3	224
3	228
3-5	228
4	212, 246, 262,
	297, 304
4-5	212
5	214-15, 220,
	215

JOHN	
	PAGE
6 5-7	209 foll.
5-9	222 foll.
6	274, 225
7	270, 274-82
9	275, 286-92
10	51, 297, 302,
	306 foll.,
	248-51
11	215 foll., 226,
	222, 254, 262
12	51, 227-8, 242
12-13	222 foll.
13	222, 229-42
14-15	222
15	129, 199, 224,
	228, 252, 251,
	406
15-21	402 foll.
16	241, 261
16-17	406
17	414
18	52
19	26, 227, 244,
	418, 422
20	56
21	27, 425, 422,
	428, 442
22	241
23	99
26	214, 226, 274,
	297, 280, 444
26-65	440
27	226, 296
30	475
31	202, 225, 229,
	475, 477
31 foll.	225
32	22, 214, 229,
	222
35	200, 222
37	140
39	242
42	129
44	424
45	112
49	225, 477
51	200, 244
51-9	240
52	122, 247
52-3	200
52-8	247
54	240
54-6	200
55	225
56	201, 246
57	246
58	246-7, 477

JOHN	
	PAGE
6 59	47, 200
60	22, 122, 126
61	126
63	401
66	411
66-7	129, 461
67	501
67-70	226
68	260
68-9	467
70	129, 141-2,
	478
71	129, 501
7 I	406
1-35	407
3	80, 406
4-5	146
5	124
14	260
28	25, 260
33	42
36	22
37-8	401
43	112
8 12	25, 194
16	22, 24
17-18	156, 517-18
20	260
32-44	516
37	226, 407, 444
39	42
44	122
49	125, 517
50	521
51	21
52	21
55	21
56	229, 516
57	211
59	118, 125
9 1-7	404
4	526
5-7	404
6	429-60
6-7	472
11	220
15	220
16	112
17	401
18	220
24	517
28	401
33	401
35	401
35-6	427
39	8, 401
10 6	47, 221

INDEX

JOHN		JOHN		JOHN	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
10	8 252	12	32 404	16	1 123
	11 foll. 281		32-3 19		1-2 120
	12 252-3		33 42		2 510
	15-18 515		38 22		8 522
	16 256		39 144		11 29
	19-21 113		39-40 6		17 13
	28 253, 242		39-43 440		20 169
	29 253		40 5, 8, 401		21 169
	31 113, 118		47-8 512		21-2 48
	35 21		48 521		22 169
	39 118		49 396		24 169
	41 194		50 396		25 13
11	3 104, 381	13	1 80		25 foll. 47
	5 104, 381		4 foll. 222		29-32 14
	7 406		5 155, 222		32 120, 156, 224
	9 123		10 51		33 123, 169, 510
	10 123		10-11 461-2	17	1 228, 321
	11 101, 104, 189		12-14 462		3 23
	14 100-106		16 150		11 140
	23 189		17 396		12 145, 242
	24 189		18 141-2, 145,		15 142
	25 189		345-6		18 150
	33 104, 473		18-21 478		26 396
	33 foll. 281		21 145	18	9 22, 242
	34 292		27 361		20 47
	35 104		29 274, 300, 376		28 213, 412
	36 104		33 42		32 22
	38 104, 473		34 51, 395		36 254
	39 101		34-5 394	19	4 296
	41 103, 223,		35 396		12 77, 323
	320-21	14	3 55-6		13 115-16
	44 474		8 222		15 77
	48 77		9 16		16-17 56
	52 264		15 396		17 509
	55 212-13, 461,		18 255, 396		19 509
	463		23 16, 158, 324,		24 323
12	2 377		396, 524		25 509
	6 341		27 169, 392		29 399
	7 51		30 89		31 509
	10 105-6	15	1 22		35 23, 167
	13 319		2 141, 400		36 322
	20 401		3 461	20	7 64
	20 foll. 19		3-4 51		8-9 441
	21 240, 222		4 301		12 63
	21-2 156		5 395, 515		19 58
	23 502, 522		7 396		21 150
	23-6 510		9 foll. 394		22 322
	24 10, 18, 30,		10 396		22-3 522
	367, 309		11 169		29 487
	24-5 27		12 396	21	4 427, 424
	25-6 91, 377		13 396		9 211, 317,
	26 524		13-15 222		365-6, 370
	27-8 523		14 323, 396		10 337
	28-9 10		16-19 141-2		11 322
	29 502, 524		20 21, 510		12 222-3, 435
	31 89, 91		25 21		13 211, 216, 218,
	31-3 89, 523		27 157		322, 365-6

SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES

JOHN

	PAGE
21 15 foll.	259
15-17	264
15-22	223, 263
17	486
19	526
19-23	511
20	526
22	526
25	40

ACTS

1 3	486
4	221
6-12	48
8	156
11	522
15	14
22	156
2 1 foll.	343
12	300
32	156
40	71, 82
41	343
46	234-5
47	343
4 4	351-3
9	176
16	106
29-30	21
5 24	300
6 7	19-20, 353
7 56	326
9 37-8	183
10 12	453
14	450
15	412
17	300
28	450
34-8	21
38	671
12 10	38
24	19
14 9	176
15 5	41, 374
8	41
16 14	326
17 3	326
21	265
18 7	80
7-17	363
18	416
21	416-17
19 23	404
20 35	25, 217
22 20	156

ACTS

	PAGE
24 22	404
24-7	199
25	265
26 2-27	186
11	180
27 3	408

ROMANS

6 16	507
7 7	121
14-24	512
9 4	391
21	126
27	351
10 15	163
11 7-25	441
11	173
15-32	328
22	173
25	6
25-33	6
27	391
12 8	73
14	219
13 9	121
14 1	126
4	173
13	126
14	437, 450
15 foll.	456
20	126
21	126
15 1	126
16 16	378-9

1 CORINTHIANS

1 13	326, 383
17-22	119
2 1	17
16	463
3 2	299
6	299
12	304
15	179
4 7	317
20	21
5 6 foll.	371
7	370
8	313
7 31	90
8 1 foll.	456
10 4	325
12	173

1 CORINTHIANS

	PAGE
10 16-17	311
17	363-4
11 20	327
23	393
25	393
30	184
12 13	299
13 8	173
12	5
15 12	189
16 20	378-9

2 CORINTHIANS

2 2	427
13	416
3 6-14	391
14-15	441
4 10	16
14	178
5 20	396
7 10	427
13 1	156
5	236
12	378

GALATIANS

3 13	115
15	296
15 foll.	290
17-29	290
4 1	391
3	327
19	43
24	391
5 6-9	374
9	370, 373
6 2	463

EPHESIANS

2 12	391
17	265
3 19	17
4 20-21	57
5 14	169
6 14	174

PHILIPPIANS

2 6	263
3 12	511
4 12	307

INDEX

COLOSSIANS

	PAGE
2 2	17
5	313
6	37
8	34
3 5	313

1 THESSALONIANS

1 5	21
2 13	37
5 26	373-9

1 TIMOTHY

1 19	425
4 1	127
6 9	33

2 TIMOTHY

2 15	234
18	189
3 2	230
4 14	121

TITUS

1 15	453, 456
------	----------

PHILEMON

10	240
12	240

HEBREWS

1 9	175
5 8	400

HEBREWS

	PAGE
6 18	153
8 8-10	301
9 4	37
16-17	390
19-20	393
10 28-31	180
12 3	173
5	173
22-4	513
23	520
13 11-13	509

JAMES

1 10	303
11	303
25	513
2 15	305
3 4	424
5 10-11	173
13	173
13-15	173-6 fol.
14	175, 179, 193
15	176 foll.
18	37

1 PETER

1 6-7	422
19	513
24	303
4 12	422
5 1	153
14	373

2 PETER

2 8	423
10	185
17	424

1 JOHN

	PAGE
1 1-2	157
7-9	463
2 1	43, 73
7	395
8	395
9-10	130
12 foll.	27
17	90
18-28	187
20	187
27	187
3 1-3	463
2	37
14	30
16	240
17	247, 249
4 1	235
5 6-7	157
8	153
14-16	123
16	177-80

3 JOHN

14	333
----	-----

REVELATION

1 4	237
5	153
13	174
2 2	235
13	153
3 14	153
5 6	355
7 9	351
11 3	153
12 9	91
17 6	153
20 5-6	189

INDEX

II. ENGLISH

["c. w." means "confused, or confusable, with"; "conn. w." means "connected with"; "interch. w." means "interchanged, or interchangeable, with."]

Aaron, an apostle 238; the sons of 257

Able, "I am a. [to]" = Heb. and Gk "I find [how to]" 271; "not a." applied to Jesus 127-42, to Zeus 129

Aboth, i.e. *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, on:—the teacher that hides his knowledge 29; "the banquet" 256; subduing one's nature 272; s. also 305

About, before numbers of men 246-9; (Heb.) like, (LXX) [amounting] to 246; in phrases of time 419

Above, "from a." 9, 12, 194

Abraham, the country of 27; the recompense of 233 foll., 236, 232; the feast of 230; the lad, or messenger, of 232; the covenant (LXX *diathēkē*) with 227 foll.; the inheritance of 227-8; the mind of, passes out of itself 507; the vision of, of the triumph of humanity 516; lifting up his eyes 228, 265-7, 285; bidden to look up 484; looking up, or receiving insight 487-8; on the third day 265-7; tempted by God 225; taking [a heifer] for God 216; s. also 229, 256, 252, 487-8, 517

Abyss, the, in Lk. 86, 91

Acceptable, for "not without honour" 126

Acknowledge [God's greatness etc.], rendered in LXX bless 230

Acknowledgment, includes confession and thanksgiving 262

Acts of John, the, on:—"one loaf" 218, 260; Christ's disciples as "dancing" 299

Acultha, in Mk (e) *Tabea acultha* 26

Adam, the curse on, changed 205; son of A. 465

Admiration, marvelling, or wonder 143-5

Adulterous 516, how expressed by Jn 518; conn. w. generation, why om. by Lk. 515-16

Advocate, s. Paraclete

Afar 265; s. Far

After, s. Behind, Following

Agapē, Gk, love, called *vox more biblica* 224; in LXX almost confined to Cant. 224; in Jn 224; s. *Hermas*, Wisdom of Solomon

Ain (or *En*), Heb., eye or fountain 25, 460; s. *En*

Akiba, R. 40, 447

Alectorophōnē, a new word in Gk 420; s. Cockcrowing, *Gallicinium*

Aleiphein, Gk, anoint medically 175; anoint for wrestling, hence train 123

Alēthēs, Gk, "true," not to be confused with *alēthinos* "real-and-true" 22

Alēthinos, Gk, "real-and-true" 22

Alexander, a sensualist described by Lucian 221

Alexander the Copper-smith 121

Alexander the Great, posing a Gymnosophist 190

"All that the Father giveth" 140

Allegorizing 220, 506

Allusive narrative, may be historical 487

Almightiness and foreknowledge, the problem of 141

Almighty, not a correct rendering of *Shaddai* 129

Alms(giving), the ransom of man's soul 278; interch. w. righteousness

INDEX

- 279, 466; in Lk., but not in parall. Mt. 455
- Alone 10 foll., 46; applied to Jesus in all the Gospels 228, 407; God is not a. 34; he that is a. is not necessarily deserted (Epict.) 224
- Alteration, in the risen Saviour, the 425, Chrysostom on 425-6
- Altruism, in Jn 18
- Altruistic purification 463
- Amazement, c. w. hearing 90
- Ambiguity, conn. w.:—"they" 80, 218, 228, 337; "they that were in the boat" 429-30; "them" 416; aorist c. w. pluperf. 182; affirmative c. w. interrogative 272; indicative c. w. imperative 187; "beseech" 79; raising up 176 foll., 186; arising and awaking 189; "it is [fit] for us" 272; said 291; here 296; superabound 337; broken pieces 338; wind c. w. spirit 424; men 430; inside c. w. the inside of 456; in his face c. w. before his face 489; smite c. w. kill 490; soul, in two senses 514; s. also Metaphor
- Ammonius, Origen resembles 341; on:—"foods of luxury" 274; the Five Thousand 340-41; the basketful of Judas 341
- Anachronisms, apparent 418
- And, Heb., may mean "even" 160
- Andrew, sayings of, Papias on 282, 289, comp. 291; the first to call Jesus "Christ" 496; A. and Philip, in Jn, addressed by Jesus 502
- Angel (Heb.)=some one (LXX) 317; A. of Punishment, the, in Hermas 423
- Angels, three, visit Abraham 226; c. w. holy ones or saints 518; the a. that are holy (Mk)=the holy a. (Lk.) 518; human, diff. from Michael and Raphael 520
- Anoint, (1) medically or for training, Gk *aleiphein* 175, 183; a. the sick 176 foll.; among the Jews 180; metaph. 183; the Logos anoints, i.e. trains, the wrestler Jacob 183
- Anoint, (2) for consecration, Gk *chrisein* 175, comp. 187
- Anointed, the, i.e. Christ, Messiah 495-6
- Anointing, perhaps c. w. baptizing 186-7
- Antedating 14, 46, 52-3, 186-7, 207, 223; s. Post-resurrectional
- Antichrists 187
- Antipas, s. Herod
- Aorist tense, the, c. w. pluperfect 182, 428, 440; combined with perfect 263
- Apart from children, in Exod. and Mt. 243-4
- Aphraates, on Christ thrown down and not hurt 117
- Aploia*, Gk, weather not fit for sailing 61
- Apocalypse of Ezra*, the, s. Ezra
- Apocrypha, Jewish 20
- Apologists, Early, the, words rare or unused in 48, 52, 72, 168, 184, 237, 206, 207, 221, 223, 254, 271-2, 423, 431
- Aporein*, Gk, perplex or pose 190
- Aposiopesis 146
- Apostatize, parall. to "be offended" 127
- Apostle, or *Sheliach*, Moses a. 223, 228; Aaron a. 223
- Apostles, the Sending of the 148 foll.; in pairs 156, 158; "whom also he named a." 217-18
- Apostolic Fathers, the, words rare or unused in 48, 52, 72, 136, 168, 183, 184, 287, 206, 207, 221, 223, 254, 271-2, 431
- Apolassomai*, Gk, "bid farewell to" 415 foll.; renounce, hence renounce the old for the new 416; a. and salute (Phrynichus) 417; contrasted w. dismiss or let go (*apoluon*) 417
- Apparition 430-4; R.V., more correct than A.V. spirit 430; of Samuel to Saul, the 432; s. *Phantasma*
- Appear before the Lord, interch. w. see the Lord 485
- Aquila (the translator of O.T.), Jerome on 298; uses *prasiai* and the verb derived from it 298; has *eucharistid* where LXX has praise 319, comp. 282; substitutes *sunthēkē* for *diathēkē*, rarely using the latter 226; s. also 221
- Aramaic 85, 110, 126, 246-7, 224, 469-71; diff. from Hebrew 470; Palestinian, has no word but *diathēkē* for "will and testament" 229-30
- Archdemon, an 92
- Arise, c. w. awake 189
- Aristōn*, Gk, break one's fast, or breakfast (vb) 222, wrongly transl. dine 223
- Armed, c. w. in the fifth [day or generation] 312

Arms (military), c. w. peg, nail, or shovel 163-8
 Article, definite, inserted or omitted 226; e.g. boat, the or a 241; wilderness, the or a 228
 Article, reduplicated, rare in Synop-
 tists 518
Artos, Gk, loaf or bread, first men-
 tion of, in LXX 206
 Ascending 13, 406
 Ashamed, the Son of Man will be 505
 "Asking the parables" 10 foll.
 Asleep, applied to Christ 50, to
 Lazarus 106, 139; s. Sleeping
 Assembled with, or eating with 231
 Assessors, human, in divine judg-
 ment 519, perhaps implied in Jn
 531
 Astonished 113 foll.
 Atheism, imputed to Christians 223
 Atheists, "away with the a." 476
 Athenagoras, on:—the kiss of love
 379-80; the charges brought
 against Christians 226
Atimos, Gk, R.V. "without honour"
 123-7; =outlawed etc. 123-4; how
 used by Justin Martyr 124
 Atonement, s. Ransom
 Attraction, spiritual 497
 Authority, s. Control
 Automatic, in Mk and Acts 22; in
 LXX 22-9
 Avarice, s. Covetousness
 Awake, metaph. 129

Babe and child 263
 Babel, the king of 232; the tower of
 523
 Bacchus or Dionysus, the orgies of
 239
 Backward, departing, misunder-
 stood 129, comp. 500
 Banquet, of the saints, in *Aboth* 256
 Baptism, called the seal 267; daily
 446-7
 Baptist, John the, called "the
 lamp" 25, "a voice" 40, "Elijah"
 194; the death of 190 foll., 425;
 Johannine non-intervention in
 matters concerning 219
 Baptize, v. r. sprinkle 446; s.
 Immerse
 Baptizing, by Christ's disciples 150;
 omitted by Mk in the Precepts to
 the Twelve 188; the b. of 4000 in
 the Acts 223
 Barley, first Biblical mention of
 237; Heb., c. w. estimation 237;
 a sign of rudimentariness 243; b.

harvest, the 206; b. loaves, conn.
 w. Elisha 226-7, 228
 Barnabas (the writer), on a parable
 12; mentions angels (pl.) only in
 one passage 518; s. also 78
 Bartimaeus 106, 403
Basanizein, Gk, test by torture, lit.
 and metaph. 421; in Plato, of
 testing the righteous 422; in
 LXX, only once with Heb. equiv.
 422-3; rare in early writers except
 Hermas 423; differently applied
 by Mk and Mt. 421 foll.
 Baskets, in the Miracles of Feeding
 206 foll., 226-44; the carrying of,
 Ammonius and Origen on 241;
 s. *Cophinoi*, *Sphurides*
 Baskets, the Feast of 206; Philo on
 206, 242; Jewish traditions on 242
 Be, c. w. become 222
 Bear, s. Carrying
 Bear witness, s. Witness
 Beckon, s. Signs, make
 Become, c. w. be 222
 Begin, in Mk 155
 Behind, "Get thee b. me, Satan,"
 perhaps an erroneous tradition
 406 foll.; "go b.," "go after,"
 or "follow" 500-501
 Believe, "I know and b." (Ign.)
 423; "believed," substituted for
 "knew" 426
 Beloved disciple, the, pp. xii-xiii,
 223, 425, 510-11
 Ben Sira, on:—the teacher that
 hides knowledge 29; prayer for
 the sick 181; the physician as
 appointed by God 181; discipline
 as bringing "rest" 219; paying
 a vow 224; righteousness (or,
 almsgiving) 279; "watering a
 garden-bed" 290; Wisdom as
 testing [by torment] 422-3;
 "there is no substitute for a
 disciplined soul" 512-13; s. also
 515
 Benediction before a meal, the 224
Berith, Heb., covenant, but not
 testament 226 foll.; rendered by
 LXX *diathēkē* but by Aquila
sunthēkē 226
 Beseech, exhort, or comfort, ambig.
 78-9
Beth, s. House, Bethsaida
 Bethel, Jacob at 237
 Bethesda, the healing at 128
 Bethsaida 227-40, 412, 427; parall.
 to Capernaum 406; a city, not a
 village 427; means House of Pro-
 vision 228; conn. w. *epistitimos*,

INDEX

- provision 229-40, 242; Lk. omits what intervenes between two Marcan mentions of 410; coming to, in Lk. 411; s. also 423
- Bid farewell, in Mk 412; and dismiss 415 foll.
- Bind, Heb., var. renderings of in LXX 469-70; bound, c. w. lame and lame-of-speech 470
- Blasphe'me, Christ 180
- Bless, not in Jn except once, as passive participle 319, distinguished by Philo from "blessed" (adj.) 319; "bless (food)," in Lk., parall. to "bless" (absol.) in Mk-Mt. 315, and to "give thanks (*eucharistein*)" in Jn 315, comp. 320; blessing God, Origen on 319; "bless [God]," conn. w. bread, confusable with "break [bread]," in Heb. and Aram. 324; s. also 318-22
- Blessing, God's, implies increasing 319
- Blind, in the prophets 15 times (11 of these in Isaiah) 403; in SS, = (Mk) hardened 423
- Blindness, healing of, in Mk and Jn 423 foll.; in Jn 429 foll.; in Isaiah and the Gospels 423-3; of Israel, the 440, twofold 423
- Blood, water and 157; of the grape, the 325; of Christians, the, is seed 39
- Board, go on, in Mk 410
- Boat, the, in Mk 55 foll., 241-2; Jesus received in the, in Mk-Mt., but not in Jn 425; of temptations, the 425; those in the, ambig. 429, Origen on 429, Jerome on 430; c. w. teaching 241; "other boats," in Mk 60 foll.
- Bodiless demon, a, in Ignatius 53, 431
- Body, the, the vessel of the soul 458; brother to the soul 508; the eye is the lamp of 32 foll.; bodies, called tombs 73
- Body, Christ's, the temple of 265
- Bond-servant, s. *Doulos*
- Bonds, loosed 470-72; s. Bind
- Books, Jn on the inadequacy of 40; Papias on, as compared with "living voice" 49, 223
- Bowels, implied, for Jews, son and love, for Greeks, resentment 240-50; perhaps parall. to Jn's "only begotten" 250; of Joseph, the 251; s. Compassion
- Brass, money 172; meaning dross 173
- Bread, in the Precepts to the Apostles 159; the staff of 159; daily 203; in the Lord's Prayer 203-205; in Mk 206; *lit.* loaves 212; a famine, not of 220; c. w. here 294; c. w. for them 322; first mention of, conn. w. a curse 305, Targum on 325; a martyr's body like 329; unleavened, the Feast of 310, 312; s. *Epiousios*, Loaf
- Break, Heb., i.e. cut off, gain by violence 325
- Break [bread], c. w. spread out [the hands in blessing] 319; c. w. bless [over bread] 324
- "Breaking of bread, in the" 325
- Break-in-pieces 321 foll.; used by Mk and Lk. (Five Thousand) but not by Jn 321-2
- Breakfast (vb), or break one's fast, diff. from dine 222; s. *Aristón*
- Breath, c. w. wind or spirit 9, 40
- Brethren, Christ's 80, 124
- Bring word, parall. to declare 217
- Broken pieces, or crumbs 327; Origen on 328
- Brother to the soul, the body is 506; brothers, s. Brethren
- Bushel, under the 23, 24, 26
- But, Gk, c. w. other 60
- "But—in order that," in Jn 146
- Buy, in Synoptists, only in the Feeding of the Five Thousand 215, 269; in Jn 269, 274, 277, 281; parall. to "find" 271; b. food 269-72; "b. and eat," in Isaiah 248; s. also Ransom
- Buy-corn, Heb. *shábar*, first instance of 272
- Caesar, Jn on 77; Epictetus on the thunders of 77; tribute to 277-8; a friend of 223
- Caesarea Philippi 42, 405, 408, 467, 494; not in Lk. 412; s. Philippi
- Cakes, in the days of the Messiah 234; hidden in the embers, Clem. Alex. on 272
- Calling, the men of the, diff. from the elect 142
- Callous, hearts made 206; s. Hardening, *Pōroun*
- Callousness, *pōrōsis* 441, 479-80; s. *Pōrōsis*
- Cana, the miracle at 242, 268; servants [at table] at 277
- Canaanitish woman, the 409; s. Syrophenician

Capernaum, in Mk, parall. to his own city in Mt. 128; in Jn, parall. to Bethsaida in Mk 406; s. also 186, 414

Captain over fifty 310-11; the Messiah a 311

Captivity, the Return from 409

Carpenter, a complimentary term in Talmud 190 foll.; Origen denies that Jesus was called a 121; Justin Martyr on the works of a 123

Carrying the basket, Judas, Ammonius on 341; carrying the loaves and fishes, Origen on 356

Carrying-about God (Epict.) 16

Cast down, or cast out 91; cast down from a precipice, c. w. hang 115

Casting out, the, of the ruler of this world 89; of a spirit 523

Celsus, on Christ's neglect of "just persons" 356

Certain man (*vir*), a, interpr. as Gabriel 290; "a c. [person]" (LXX)=angel (Heb.) 317

Chains, bound in 74, 84; c. w. garments 83-4

Chaldeans, Ur of the 87

Charcoal fire, s. Coal-fire

Charity, c. w. alms 379

Chief, or head, Heb., c. w. thousand 74; c. w. the name *Rôsh* 97

Child or babe 233

Children, said to include women 346-8, 350; apart from, in Exod. and Mt. 348-50; duty of, to parents 461; in LXX freq. rendered "baggage" 340

Children of God, in Jn, =little ones in Synoptists 42, 44

Choke, "the legions that c. you" 76

Choosing of the Apostles, including Judas, the 128-9, 141-2

Choridsein, Gk, fill [cattle] with grass, i. s. satisfy in Synoptists 306, 326; deprecatively used in Jn 306-7, and in literary Greek 304, 307

Chortos, Gk, grass or hay, green, in Mk 302-9; in literary Greek, deprecative 302-3; metaph. in Paul 303-4; rare in early Christian writers 306; in LXX=two Heb. words 304; used by Mk for blade of corn 305; in LXX, first mention of, conn. w. a curse 305

Chrim, the 187-8

Christ, s. Jesus; the Coming of 522-6; s. Coming

"Christ, the," a title obscure to Gentiles 406, first given to Jesus by Andrew 406; "thou art the C.," meaning of 406; its meaning to Jesus 409

Christians, in first century, charges against 296-9

Chronological arrangement 65, 263

Chrysippus 123; on *phantasma* and "drawing" 431, 433

Chrysostom, on:—the lad with the barley loaves 288; the Feeding of the Seven Disciples 435; the post-resurrectional recognition of Jesus 435-6; Peter's use of the word parable 454-6; "Go, wash," and Naaman 494; the healing of blindness 489; s. also 26, 60, 237, 423, 435-6, 513

Chullin, Heb., common or unconsecrated food 446; a Talmudic tract 446

Church, the 25, 263; of Jerusalem 106; the growth of 251 foll.; churches, the seven 376

City, or province 87; or village 238, 467; or haven 443

Clasme, Gk, broken-thing, i. s. the bread in the Eucharist 364

Clay, anointing with, no precedent for 400; in Jn, suggestive of creation by the Father 403

Clean, and cleansing, Jn on 50-51; the Logos described as, by Epictetus 50; make clean 453; s. Purifying

Cleansing the vessel (Epict.) 467-8

Clearly, conn. w. "see," in Mk, *lit.* "[with a] far-beaming [ray]" 404

Clement of Alexandria, on:—mustard-seed 43; the Logos anointing the wrestler Jacob 133; Alexander the Great posing a Gymnosophist 199; three days 267; baptism as the seal 267; the five loaves, connected with the things of sense 291, 354; the mystical seven 355; *puros* as fire or wheat, and Christ's flesh as prepared by fire 269-70; [cakes] hidden in the embers 373; the abuse of the kiss of love 379; "behold, I am my *diathêke*" 233; the Dionysiac *ômophagiai* 396; "being pursued (?) by righteousness" 511; s. also 81, 123, 136, 143, 355

Clement of Rome, on:—the Sower 17-18; lifting up the weak 176, 186; filling (*choridsein*) the hungry 307; the 600,000 in the

INDEX

- wilderness 350; the eyes (*om-mata*) of the soul 485; angels 520; s. also 52, 78, 136, 406
- Clementine Homilies*, the 46, 199
- Cloak, would not put on a 83
- Clods, a congregation seen as, by George Fox 73
- Coal, a live 368; coal(s), only twice in O.T. 217; conn. w. Elijah and Isaiah, prepared for prophetic work 317
- Coal-fire, or fire-of-coals 366-8; symbolical 368, 428; Peter denied and confessed near a 368
- Cockcrowling, in Mk, *alektorophōnia*, a new word 419 foll.
- Coin of fire, a 377
- Coinage of David, the 173
- Come, "c. and see [a mystery]" 392
- Comfort, exhort, or beseech, ambig. 78
- Comforter, the, a rendering of the Paraclete, *qu. vid.*
- Coming, of Christ, Lk.'s view of, diff. from Mk's 523; Jn's view of 524-6; Origen on, not local but spiritual 523; s. also 368
- Coming, of God, in Heb., =self-revealing, in Targum 523
- Command, expr. by Heb. "say" 98
- Commandment, a new 395; commandments, in Jn, not expressed imperatively 51; regarded as gifts 396
- Common, in Heb. (but not Gk) unconsecrated 448
- Common hands, in Mk 448-50; s. also *Koinos*
- Common, make 412, 448
- Communion, in one loaf 365
- Communions, or *Eruhin* 363 foll.
- Companies, in Mk 296; s. *Symposia*
- Compassion, *lit.* bowels, in 1 Jn 247; parall. to child or son 248-50; s. Bowels
- Compassion, have, *lit.* "have-bowels," why not in Lk. 247 foll.; a new word in Mk 247
- Concourse, the, of "many" 326
- Confession of Peter, the, the merit of 406-7
- Confession of sins, Origen on 179
- Confessions 81, 99-100, 243-4, 518; the correct and the incorrect rendering in 399
- Conscience 531
- Consequently, implied in LXX by "hearing" 218
- Consider, c. w. set yourselves on 308-9
- Constrain, Jesus constraining the disciples 414, 417
- Control, internal and external 93
- Conviction, *elenchos*, the doctrine of, in Jn 521
- Cophinoi*, Gk, baskets, in the Miracle of the Five Thousand 308, 342-3, 375, 463; conn. w. Jews by Juvenal 344
- Coppersmith, Alexander the 121
- Corah, the censers of, Origen on 18
- Corban 376, 451
- Corn, from heaven, *i.e.* manna 239, 259; provisioning with, or *epistismos* 239; the grain of corn (or, wheat) 37, 39, 367, 369, 510; buy-corn, Heb. *shābar* 373
- Cosmopolitan doctrine 374, yet homely 383
- Cosmos, the, ambig. 90
- Country, of Abraham, the 87; Christ's own c. 109-11; "outside the c.," in Mk 36 foll.
- Covenant, of salt, a 231
- Covenant, or testament, *diathēkē* 384-91; s. *Berith*, *Diathēkē*, *Sunthēkē*
- Covetousness or greediness, called idolatry 512; s. also 123
- Creation, spiritual 463; the second day of 76
- Crisis, a division or judgment 521
- Cronos, mysteries of 399
- Cross, the, only in one passage of Jn 509; terminates the Law 453-4; in Epictetus 509; in *Evang. Petri*. 70; taking up the, p. viii, 507 foll.; conn. w. yoke 507 foll.
- Crucifixion, p. xiii, 89 foll.
- Crucify, expr. by "lift up" 90, 500
- Crumbs, or broken pieces 337
- Cup, the, at the Eucharist 394
- Cure and heal 184; s. Heal, Iatric, Therapeutic
- Curse, the, pronounced on Adam 305, comp. 265
- Cushion (rower's), in Mk 62 foll.; mostly diff. from pillow 28
- D, codex D, or Bezae, readings of 10, 24, 58, 60, 63, 223, 228, 318, 419, 439, 432, 511
- Daily, day by day, for the coming day 203; d. baptism 446-7; ins. by Lk. after "take up his cross" 509; s. *Epiousios*
- Dalmanutha, unique mention of 243; parall. to Magadan 242, 400, 443, 474

- Dancing, disciples, in *Acts of John* 230
 Daniel, on stumbling 120; on running to and fro 230; confections in 244
 Dark sayings, p. vii, 13, 47
 David, the staff and scrip of 100 foll.; the coinage of 100, 172; requests five loaves 223; divides food to Israel 229-30
 David, the Son of 405
 Day, a, c. w. to-day 304-5; the third 265-8, 409; far spent 261 foll.; that he might see my 516; d. by d., or for the coming d. 203; s. *Epioustios*
 Days, four 101, three 70, 101, 265-8, two 102; after two 226, 409
 Daybreak 427
 Deacon, s. *Diaconos*
 Dead, metaph. 22; c. w. sleeping 101 foll.
 Deaf or dumb 449
 "Deal (Heb. *páras*) thy bread to the hungry," Talmud, Jerome, and Ibn Ezra on 222; s. *Páras*, *Párasch*
 Death, life through 17, 277; of the grain of corn 27, 30, 267, 209, 510; spiritual 102; c. w. sleep 101 foll.; the sin unto, Origen on 177-9; a decree of 180
 Debt, owe as a, p. ix foll.
 Deceived, Gk, c. w. loved 279
 Declare, parall. to bring word 217
 Declining day, the 261
 Decree, of death, spiritual 180
 Defilement 412, 446, 462
 Delphian oracle, the 22
 Deluge, the 77
 Demeter, Epictetus on 16
 Demon (*daimonion*), or devil, bodiless (Ign.) 58, 431; d., spirit, and *phantasma* 420 foll.
 Demons (*daimones*), an army of (Tatian) 421
 Demoniac, the, and the swine 66 foll.; apocryphal versions of 82 foll.; demoniacs, two 70
 Denarius, a labourer's daily wage 275; gold, a 276; of fire, a 277; of redemption, a 224; denarii, two hundred 274-82
 Denars, an income of two hundred 274
 Denial, Peter's 420-21; Levi's, of his brethren 506; a runaway slave's, of his master 506-7; in Hermas 127, 507
 Denying oneself, Philonian aspect of 428; not in Gk literature 506
 Depart backward 120, 500
 Depart from, and bid farewell 415
Descensus ad Inferos, the 74, 84
 Descent into Sheol, the 50
 Desert (n.), in Lk., parall. to mountains in Mt. 224; the or a 225; s. *Midbar*
 Desert place, a, ambig. 222; parall. to Bethsaida 227; s. *Midbar*
 Deserted, diff. from alone 224
 Desertedness or a desert, *erímia*, Epictetus on 224
 Desire (n.), a neutral term 121-2; Origen on 122; only once in Jn, plur. 122
 Destroy, or lose 514
 Detail, diffuse, in Mk 244, 445
 Devil, in SS=Gk *phantasma* 420; one of you is a d. 141, 414; s. Demon, *Phantasma*
Diaconesis, Gk, serve at table, in Jn 277
Diaconos, Gk, servant [at table], c. w. deacon 277; in Mk and Jn, but not in Lk. 277; diff. from *doulos*, bondservant or slave 510
Diatessaron, the 55, 152-3, 220, 256, 425, 428, describes two visits to Nazareth 112 foll.; on the Samaritan and the Syrophoenician woman 427
Diathēhē, lit. Gk and Aram. "[last will and] testament," but LXX covenant (Heb. *berith*) 224-21; R.V. (of Eucharist) covenant or testament 225; first mention of (LXX) conn. w. Noah, Heb. *berith*, R.V. covenant 225 and Aq. and Sym. *sunthēhē*, compact 226; Philo on, implies inheritance 227-8; d. the only word in Palestin. Aram. to express will and testament 229; in the Epistles, implies a testator 220; Paul, in mentioning, hampered by LXX 221; the new 222
Didachē, the, i.e. *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, on:—the receiving of bread 159, 206; Eucharistic ritual 224-5, comp. 226
Didrachm, i.e. half shekel 220
 Die, i.e. spiritual death 102; Philo on 420
 Dilemma, a 199
 Diligently, or with the fist 446
 Diminutive, Gk, the 43, 60, 220-21
 Dine, a wrong rendering of *aristēn*, breakfast (vb) 222; in Lk. 222
 Diogenes, condemns Plato for never grieving a disciple 429

INDEX

- Dionysus, the orgies of, Clem. Alex. on 399
- Disciple, the beloved, s. Beloved
- Disciples, described as "house" 14; c. w. the [men] in the boat 430, 440; the seven 317, 323, 355 foll.
- Discipline, in Ben Sira and in Wisdom of Solomon 219, 324
- Dismiss, and bid farewell 415
- Distressed, or tormented 431 foll.; differently applied by Mk and Mt. 431; Origen on 424-5; s. *Basanizein*
- Distributing, c. w. breaking 325; s. Divide
- Distribution of bread to the Five Thousand, Jn differs from Synop-
tists as to 333, 356
- Divide [food] 329-30; Mk's word not used by Jn 332; c. w. divide by dissension 332
- Division or schism, in Jn 113
- Dogs, Gentiles called by Jews 466; "cast it to the d.," perhaps wrongly assigned 466; Victor on 466; allegorized by Origen 466
- Double meaning of words, e.g. spirit 40, lift up 90, staff 180, save 176, raise up 176, smite 469 etc.
- Double Tradition of Mt. and Lk., the 125, 279, 335, 373
- Doulos*, Gk, bondservant or slave, diff. from *diakonos* servant [at table] or minister 510
- Dove, cooing like a, of a divine Voice 478
- Down, or out 91
- Dramatic expression, in Jn 10, 213, 246-9, 381, 377, 463-3, 510, 524
- Draught of fishes, a, in Lk. 436, in Jn 428, comp. 116
- Drawing out the soul to the hungry 361, 375
- Drawing power, the, of the Logos (Epict.) 433; of Nature (Epict.) 433; of the Father and the Son (Jn) p. xii, 434
- Drawn-and-dragged (Epict.) 434
- Drink (n. and vb), in Jn 300
- Driving, in Gk, may mean rowing 434
- Dumb, in Isaiah (Heb.) =stammering (LXX) 264; Ibn Ezra on 264; or speechless 469; or deaf 469; c. w. maimed or lame 470; s. Stuttering
- Duplication, emphatic 453
- Dust, the, the ground of 72; heaped up d. or mound, uniquely mentioned by Justin Martyr 73
- Duty, of children to parents, Talmud on 451
- East and West 320
- Eating, Gk verbs signifying 345, not distinguished in R.V. 347, s. *Esthiesin*, *Phagein*, *Trôgein*
- Eating, in the presence of the Lord 357-60; e. (or, being assembled) with, applied to Jesus 321
- Eating, common, i.e. common to the Gentiles 440; s. *Koinophagiâ*
- Eating, swine's flesh 452
- Egypt, Israel in 264, 473; Joseph in 251; or Sin, a prison 473, comp. 76
- Elbow, up to the 448; s. Fist
- Elders, the 175-82
- Elect, the 142
- Election, God's 141; the problem of 143
- Elements, the 337
- Elenchos*, Gk, conviction, the doctrine of, in Jn 531
- Eleusis, the mysteries of 18
- Eliezer Ben Hyrcanus 451
- Elijah, stood up as fire 191; and the Baptist 191, 194; and Jesus, the retirements of 465; and Moses 519; s. also 317, 409
- Elisha, and barley loaves 275, 287, 328; bidding farewell to his home 416
- Emmaus, the narrative of 325; shews traces of LXX 263
- Emotion, imputed to Jesus 104
- Emphasis 329, 396, 513; insertion for 9, 22, 296, 355 etc.
- En* (or *Ain*), Heb., =eye or fountain 460
- Enemies, a man's, in his own heart 503
- Enlighten and baptize 186
- Ephphatha* 472-3; in Mk, illustr. by "come forth" in Jn 473
- Ephrem, i.e. Ephraemus Syrus, on:—"he knoweth not how" 37; Christ's flying in the air 117; s. also 76, 467
- Epictetus, on:—man as carrying about God 16; Demeter and the mysteries of Eleusis 16; hiding, conn. w. sowing 31; the Gods and the Logos, as clean and cleansing 50; *aploia* (only once mentioned) 61-2; Caesar's thunder 77; "things possible," not to be discussed 133; [shoes] fastened (metaph.) 167; anointing (only once mentioned) 184; deserted-

- new or *ovimid* 224; kings as metaph. shepherds 252; *chorlos* and *choridassin*, used depreciatively 204, 207; Caesar's friends 222; *apolassomas* 415-16; man as "the logical creature" 422; the drawing power of the Logos 422; the example of Socrates 424; *phantasia* 422-4; cleansing the vessel 457; peace 503; a slave denying his master 506-7; the cross (only once mentioned) 509
- Epiousios*, Gk, perhaps = daily, Origen on 204; various explanations of 204-5
- Ephraim 91, 177
- Epistimos*, Gk, provisioning, c. w. Heb. *Saida* in Beth Saidā 222-9; only once in N.T. 229-40
- Eponymous, place-names called, by Origen 71
- Erubin*, or communions 222 foll.
- Essenes, the, Hippolytus, Josephus, and Philo on 161-4; were anointed for fellowship (Philo) 122; the salt at the meals of 221
- Esthierin*, Gk, eat, never used by Jn 244; altered by Jn in quotation 245; s. *Trögein*
- Estimation, c. w. barley 227
- Eucharist, the passionateness of the 275; eucharistic doctrine preceded the 275; accounts of the 272
- Eucharistein*, Gk, give thanks, used by Jn for bless 212
- Eucharistid*, Gk, in Aquila (LXX praise, or sacrifice of praise) 219, comp. 222
- Eucharistic food, Jn's view of 222
- Eusebius, on Polycarp's martyrdom 269
- Evangelistic paraphrase of words of Jesus 259
- Evangelium Petri* 56, 70
- Even or evening, called the first watch 420
- Evenings, between the two 262
- Exalt, might mean crucify 20
- Exarchs, a name given by Macarius to two demoniacs in Mt. 74
- Exchange, a thing to be given in, or equivalent, for the soul, in Mk, meaning of 512-13; why om. by Lk. 514; how expr. by Jn 515; Origen and Chrys. on 513; there is no e. for a disciplined soul (Ben Sira) 512-13
- Excommunication, the Talmud on 120; inflicted by the Sanhedrin 447
- Exhort, beseech, or comfort, ambig. 72
- Exodus, the departure of Israel from Egypt 204, 249
- Exodus, the Book of, and Numbers 250
- Exorcism, Jn's attitude to 67, 89-92
- Expounding, private, in Mk 45 foll.
- Eye, the, metaph. 22; a good or single 227, 456; the only Marcan instance of 456; Gk *omma* 425; in Heb., c. w. fountain 440
- Ezekiel, a speaker of parables 5, 126; a son of man, bidden to sigh 472
- Esra*, the *Apocalypse* of 20; on reclining on the hay 200
- Face, spit before the, c. w. spit in the 469; s. Spitting
- Faith, a co-operation of, in healing 127
- Fame, or report 122
- Family, c. w. flesh 22
- Family meal, Jewish, the father at a 275
- Famine, not of bread, a 220
- Far, come from 264; him that is far off 265
- Far-beaming (R.V. clearly) 464-5
- Farewell, bid 413 foll.; c. w. dismiss 415 foll.; s. *Apolassomas*
- Father of a family, a, at a Jewish meal 275
- Father's house, my, ambig. 109
- Fear, not conn. w. the Resurrection by Jn 52
- Feast, c. w. foot 246; of the Jews, the 212-13
- Feed, Heb., c. w. know, or cause to know, i. s. teach 257
- Feeding, miracles of 202-402 *passim*
- Feeding of the Five Thousand, the, Jn differs from the Synoptists as to 255
- Feeding of the Four Thousand, the, a personal note in 222
- Feeding of the Seven Disciples, the 217, 225; and of Elijah 217-18
- Feet, at his, c. w. on their f. 245
- Feet, the Washing of 462
- Felix, and Paul 129, 225
- Few, expr. by five 291, 292
- Field, parall. to garden 44-5; fields, or farms 442; s. Market-place
- Fifth, day or generation, c. w. armed 212
- Fifths, i. s. sections of the Law 211
- Fifty, the symbol of repentance 202,

INDEX

310; the Messiah, a captain over 310-11; c. w. five or fifths 311; c. w. arrayed for battle 311
 Fifties, and hundreds 309-14; Origen on 310; captains of 310, Jerome on 310-11, Talmud on 311
 Fill [*lit.* with grass or fodder], s. *Chortdsein*
 Find, *i. s.* am able 371; be found, or be bought 371; Isaac sowed and found (not reaped) 38
 Fire, a denarius of 377; of coals, a 367-8, 428; testing by f. and water 423, 428
 First, prefixed to Peter's name 155
 First Biblical mention of:—sowing 38; signs 140; buy-corn (*shdbar*) 372; ransoming the soul 377; tempting 385; (LXX, an error) barley 387; lad (Heb. *naar*) 387-8; here, or hither 394; bread (or, loaf) along with grass 305, and with a curse 365; taking (ritual) 316; superabound 340; about (with numbers of men) 340; *geber* (pl.) men of military age 340; numbering 351; LXX *diaihêkê*, Heb. *berith*, Aq. *sun-thêkê* 335-6; inherit 387; *Ain* or *En* meaning fountain 461; (LXX) the oppressed 472; walking 468
 Fish, Gk, *ichthus*, a Christian symbol 335; Jewish traditions about 335; and serpent 335
 Fishes, two, or a few, perhaps symbolic 390, 318; from the Well that followed Israel 334; s. *jinnon*
 Fist, with the, or diligently 448
 Fit, "it is [fit] for us," ambig. 373
 Five, c. w. fifth, fifty, and arrayed for battle 311-12; might mean a few 391, 393; regarded mystically 351, 354; f. senses, Philo on 123
 Five loaves, perhaps symbolic 390, Clem. Alex. on 354; requested by David 293
 Five thousand, in Gk, c. w. two hundred 376
 Five Thousand, the Feeding of the 303-402 *passim*
 Five Thousand in the Acts, Irenaeus and Origen on 352 foll.
 Flesh, his own, c. w. his family 36; of swine, the 453; f. and blood 401; "who shall give us f. to eat?" 347
 Flock, in Lk. and Jn 355
 Flowers, trampling on (Jerome) 303, an error 303, 306-9

Following Jesus, ways of 510-11; f. Satan 501; s. Behind
 Food, blessing God over 315 foll.
 Foods, all, purified by Jesus 453
 Fool, Heb., c. w. rowing 434
 Foot, c. w. feast 346; c. w. on account of 347; on foot, ambig. 345-7; s. also Feet
 Footsoldiers, c. w. on my account 350
 For (prepos.), "for them," c. w. bread 353
 Foreknowledge, and almightiness, the problem of 141; Christ's 103
 Form, in another 432
 Fountain, or well 35, 440; of life, the 35; me, the f. 400; Heb., c. w. eye 440
 Four, regarded mystically 354
 Four Thousand, the Feeding of the, a more personal note in, than in the Feeding of the Five Thousand 363; conn. w. three days 363-7
 Four Thousand, the baptizing of, in the Acts 253
 Fourth Gospel, the, s. John
 Fourth watch of the night, the 418-21, 437
 Friend, Caesar's, in Jn and Epict. 383; friends, my, in Lk. and Jn 383-3; the f., in 1 Jn 333
 From, *i. s.* "some of" 336-7
 Froward, "thou wilt shew thyself," addressed to God 505
 Fullnesses of baskets, in Mk 336 foll.
 Fulvia, another Herodias (Jerome) 300
 Funeral clothing 63

Gab, Heb., a ridge 115-16
Gab-batha 115
 Gabriel, "a certain man" 290
 Gadarenes 71 foll.
 Galilaeans 406
 Galilee, perhaps an error for Judaea 153-5
Gallicinium, = *alectrophônîs* (Mk) 430
 Garden, parall. to earth and to field 44-5
 Garden-beds 396; s. *Prasias*
Gargushta, Heb., *i. s.* clay or dirt 72-3
 Garments, c. w. chains 83-4
 Gate (SS), of a city called Bethsaida 338
 Gather [themselves] together, in Mk 318
Geber, Heb., = man of military age 345; first pl. instance of 346

ENGLISH

- Generation, this, *i.e.* this evil g. 477;
adulterous 515-18
- Gennesaret and Capernaum 414
- Gennesaret-traditions 65
- Gentile life, eating etc. 440; *s.*
Koinophagia, *Koinos*
- Gentiles, go not unto 151
- Gerasenes 71 foll.
- Gergesenes 71 foll.; fellow-citizens
of swine (Origen) 83
- Gird armour on, c. w. hump-backed
470
- Girdle, lit. or metaph. 170 foll.; for
money 173; a golden 174
- Give, giving, etc., Jn's first mention
of 26; most freq. in Jn 27; given,
applied by Jn to works 140, and
to commandments 296: "all that
the Father giveth me" 140; "give
ye them to eat," om. by Jn 255;
"that he should give something
to the poor" 240 foll.
- Giver, God regarded as the 140
- Give thanks 315, 319; *s.* *Eucharis-
tein*, Thanks
- Glorification, the Passion and the
Crucifixion regarded as a 500, 510,
comp. 90
- Glorifying, and glory, in Jn 523-4
- "Glory of his Father, the" 523-6,
Origen on 523
- Gnostic tradition 399-400
- "Go [and] see," in Mk 223, 229-33
- Go down, of God, Targ. be manifest-
ed 523
- Go round, c. w. swine 25
- Go upright 518
- God, the secret of 15; the foreknow-
ledge of 141; works by developing
373; in the highest sense, humane
517; the Giver, in Jn 140; the
most ancient of all fountains
(Philo) 400; the fountain of living
waters (Jerem.) 400; smiting
Israel 409; "froward" 505;
"coming" or "going," in Heb.,
interpr. as "being manifested"
in Targ. 523
- Gold, of the Temple, the 451
- Gold denarii 276
- Goliath and David 161
- Gospel, for the sake of the, in Mk
511
- Gospel of the Infancy, the Arabic 33
- Gospel of Peter, the, *s.* *Evangelium
Petri*
- Gospels, the, *s.* John, Luke, Mark,
Matthew
- Grace, in Lk. and Jn 120; and truth
26, 120, 318
- Grain of corn (or wheat), the death
of the 27, 20, 267, 309, 510
- Grape, the blood of the, Origen on
326
- Grass, LXX *Chortos*, Heb. two words
304; in Heb. denotes transience
but not degradation 304; in Mk,
called "green" 302-9; in Mt.,
called by Jerome *arens foenum*
303; winter the season of green
g. in Palestine 304-5; of the field,
conn. w. a curse 305; diff. from
green [grass] (Philo) 306; *s.* *Chortos*
- Grass, fill [cattle] with, feed full 306;
hence, depreciatively, cram 304;
s. *Choridsein*
- Great, c. w. many 357
- Greediness, called by Paul idolatry
513
- "Greeks, certain" 18
- Green grass, in Mk 302-9; green
[grass] diff. from grass (Philo) 306
- Grief, to cause, sometimes a teacher's
duty 429
- Grieved, Peter was, by Jesus 426
- Groaning, Jesus described as 104,
473
- Ground, of the dust, the 73
- Hades and Satan 75
- Hagar 391, and the woman of
Samaria 35, 441; by a fountain
441; allusion to the story of 294-6
- Haggada, the 20
- Half-shekel or *didrachm*, the 200
- Hallowing, of the Sabbath, the 394
- Hands, the washing of 445 foll.;
common h. 446, a phrase only in
Mk 450
- Hang, lit. and metaph. 114; *i.e.*
crucify 115; c. w. cast down from
a precipice 115
- Haran 87
- Harbour, *s.* Haven
- Hardening, or blindness, of the
heart in Mk, implied by Jn 423-
40; of the disciples 306, 473-81;
of Israel 441; (SS) blind 423; *s.*
Pörösis
- Harvest, the heavenly 25; in Mt.,
Lk., and Jn 154
- Hating one's life or soul 27, 91, 377,
503
- Haven (R.V.) the, of their desire
243; Heb. city, or market-place
243, 446
- Hay, in O.T. (A.V.) 304; Jerome on
303; reclining on the (*Esv. Apoc.*)
309; *s.* *Chortos*

INDEX

- Head, or chief, c. w. the name *Rôsh* 97
 Headrest, or pillow, rarely means rower's cushion 63
 Heal, c. w. save spiritually 176, 183, 185; by stages, in Mk and Jn 464-6; s. Iatric, Therapeutic
 Hear, passively or receptively 9; c. w. be amazed 99; "hear ye," in Mk 8; "hear, O Israel" 9; hearing, ins. in LXX, implies "consequently" 318
 Heart, hardness, blindness, or callousness of, s. *Pôrôsis*
 Heaven, meaning of, Jn on 475 foll.
 Heir, Abraham an 338
 Hemerobaptists 447
 Heracleon, on the heavenly harvest 25
 Herbs, in O.T. and N.T. 44; greater than all the 41-2
 Herd, the rational (Macarius) 92
 Here (or hither), c. w. bread 294; first Biblical mention of 294-5; c. w. vision 295; ambig. 295
 Hermas, Mk illustrated from 12, 68, 137, 423; on:—parables 12; the Lord of the Country 68; riches as leading to denial of the Lord 137; one understanding...one love (*agapê*) 334; the Angel of Punishment 423; *basanîsîn* 423; never uses *diathêkê* 386; s. also 48, 245, 416, 506-7, 511
 Herod Antipas 465; and John the Baptist 190-202, 405
 Herods, various, confused, s. Philip
 Herodias, not connected by Josephus with the Baptist's death 195-6; the daughter of 197; Fulvia another H. 300
 Hezekiah 468, in Talmud 89
 Hidden, things 1; h. in order to be manifested 27, comp. 20; [cakes] h. in the embers, Clem. Alex. on 372; was hidden, or hid himself 118; a God that hidest thyself 5; hiding knowledge, a teacher blamed for 29
 Hillel 394; and Shammai 447
 Hippolytus, on the Essenes 163
 Hither, inserted for emphasis 296
 Holy, the angels that are 518; the h. angels 518; holy-ones, or saints, assessors in the Judgment 519; conflated as holy angels 520
 Homeliness, of Christ's doctrines, the 373-4, comp. 283
 Honour, without, i.e. rejected 123 foll.; s. *Atimos*
Horas Hebraicas, on:—Gergesenes 73-8; the Legion 77; Gabbatha 116; "barley loaves" and "see" 292; common food 448; s. also 89, 118, 172, 183, 447, 451, 469
 Hosea, the third day in 266, quoted by Midrash on the third day in Genesis 266; on the smiting of Israel by God 499-500
 Hosts, Lord of 139
 Hours of the night, differently reckoned 419
 House, disciples regarded as a 14; might be ambig. 128; metaph. (Jerome) as Church 261
 Householder, in Mt., parall. to man in Mk 38-7
 Human being, man meaning 517-18, comp. 156-7
 Humane, in the highest sense, God is 517
 Humanity, the Son of Man the champion of 517
 Hump-backed, c. w. he that girdeth on his armour 470
 Hundred, the symbol of perfection (Jerome) 303; by hundreds 309
 Husband 248
 Hyperbole, not allowable in historians 331; h. or metaphor? 416
 Hypocrisy, tacitly condemned by Jn 131, 214
 Hypocrites 453
 Iatric and therapeutic healing, two Gk words 184-5, comp. 490
 Ibn Ezra, on:—"a God that hidest thyself" 5; "dew of light" 44; "the dumb shall sing" 264; "deal (i.e. break) thy bread" 323; s. also 144, 272, 246, 496, 492
Ichthus, Gk, fish, a Christian symbol 335; s. Fish
 Idolatry, covetousness, which is 518
 Idols 83
 Ignatius, on:—the risen Saviour, not "a bodiless demon" 56, 431; new leaven 370; Peter and his friends 431; "be ye salted in Him" 373; "I know and believe" 435-7; "Let me be given to the wild beasts" 509; s. also 183, 416
 Immerse, and wash 446, 450
 Impediment in speech 467 foll.; s. Stuttering
 Imperative, rare in Jn, p. ix; c. w. indicative 99, 187; pres. imper., meaning of 205
 In (not by) the Lord Jesus 437

Incantations 187
 Inclining, or declining, of the day 261 foll.
 Indefinite use of 3rd pers. pl. 20, 218, 228, 227
 Indicative, c. w. imperative 99, 187
 Infirm, not in Lk. or early Christian writers 184; Origen on 184
 Infirmary 178; the chain of in Mk. the variety of in Mt. 471
 Inheriting, Philo on 287-8; first mention of, conn. w. Abraham 287; s. *Diathēkē*
 Inside, or the inside of, ambig. 456-7; c. w. in your power 467
 Insight, see with 468
 Intermediation of the Twelve, not in Jn 314-15, 323-3
 Interrogative, ambig. 278, 500-1 etc.
 Intervention, Johannine, s. John
 Irenaeus, on:—rain and God's word 24-5; "living voice" 49; God's remembering the dead 73-3; heretical "redemption" of the dying 177; running-to-and-fro in Daniel 220; the 5000 in the Acts 252; s. also 199, 254
 Irony, Johannine 56, 254, 463, 523 etc.
 IS, WAS, and COMING, the 267
 Isaac, the substitute for 228; Philo on the sacrifice of 265; sows and finds 38
 Isaiah, on Israel ransomed and healed 264, 473; influence of, on Jesus 5-8, 500, (LXX) on Mark 264, 468-71; s. also 492-3
 Ishmael, regarded as the "lad" of Abraham 263
 Israel (the nation), a lily among thorns 20; the return of, from captivity 264
 Jabneh, the vineyard in 299
 Jacob, the staff of 150; at Peniel 183; at Bethel 257
 Jairus, or Ioarash 97, perhaps conn. w. *Rōsh*, head or ruler 97
 James, the Epistle of, on anointing with oil 175 foll.
 Jerome, on:—"sendeth his word" 21; faith as a grain of mustard-seed 42; Christ's country 110; "thy rod and thy staff" 180; Fulvia as "another Herodias" 200; "he made him [Joseph] lord of his house" 251; the wandering sheep 255; three days 267; the Johannine "lad" as Moses 290; the loaves and fishes 290; a

garden-bed thirsting for rain 299; trampling on the flesh and its flowers 293; grass, in Mt., *arvens foenum* 293; fifty, mystical significance of 210-11; Christ's sowing of food 240; he that cheweth my bread 246; the 5000 in the Acts 252; leaven (metaph.) 272; Heb. *berith*, *foedus*, LXX *testamentum* 286; "those who were in the boat" and "the men" 429-30; Peter, wrong in using the word parable 454; the ransom of Israel and of the soul 514-15; renders Gk. "I know" by *vidi* 427; s. also 9, 71-2, 157, 212, 223, 462
 Jerome (i.e. Pseudo-Jerome on Mk), on:—"he knoweth not how" 87; not dead but sleeping 101; the seven baskets etc. 243; s. also 29, 64, 175
 Jesus, foreknowledge attributed to 103; emotion attributed to 104; the sense of responsibility in 478; attempts on the life of, in Jn 118 foll.; homeliness of the doctrines of 273; revolutionary miracles of 283; temporary unpopularity of 405, 411; the doctrine of, on purifying 455 foll., 461, on the good eye 459; described as marvelling 143; tempting Philip 264; walking on the sea 403-41; journeying in North Palestine 407-12, 423; constraining the disciples 414; grieving Peter 428-9; purifying all foods 453; wiping off on Himself the sins of others (Origen) 223, 462; like Elijah, retiring to Sidon 465; sighing, on two occasions, in Mk 467, 474; looking up, in Lk. 465; lifting up His eyes, in Jn 820
 Jews, the, in Jn 218, 263; i.e. the rulers of the people 407; conn. w. purification 461; s. Passover
 Jinon, Heb., shall abound, (Schöttg.) shall be multiplied like fishes 223
 Jochanan, R., called the Son of the Smith 121; on a threefold cord 157; on cakes in the days of the Messiah 284
 Johannine Epistle, s. John, the First Epistle of
 Johannine irony, s. Irony
 John the Baptist, s. Baptist
 John, i.e. the (unknown) author of the Fourth Gospel, intervenes to explain or correct Mark, p. vi and

INDEX

- passim*; regards all Christ's teaching as "proverbs," p. vii, 13; avoids imperatives, p. ix, 51; uses freq. parentheses 63; varies metaphors 166, 281; does not invent 62, 289; prefers positives to negatives 214; avoids Synoptic names 124, 240; sometimes tacitly dissents where Lk. agrees with Mk 222; expresses Synoptic thoughts in Johannine words 510; distinguishes passive from receptive hearing 9; deprecates the notion that Jesus taught in secret 47; calls miracles signs 140; emphasizes joy and peace 169 foll.; tacitly contrasts "the Jews" with Christians 212; expresses truth dramatically 10, 213, 240-9, 231, 277, 462-3, 510, 524; ignores all distributors of bread except Jesus Himself 214-15; omits "Give ye them to eat" 255; omits all breaking of bread by Jesus 222; substitutes give thanks (*eucharistein*) for bless 218; alters *esthlein* to *trôgein* in quotation 245; meets the charge of *ômo-phagid* brought against Christians 400-1; supplies the doctrine of sacrifice implied in the breaking of bread 483; distinguishes "I" from "the word that I spake" 512; departs from the conventional conception of a judge 520; connects the end with the beginning of his Gospel 526; is perhaps influenced by Stoic doctrine on *phantasma* 424; s. also Dramatic expression, Irony
- John, on:—"the word," as first mentioned by Jesus 21; "the word" as a whole 49-51; the Logos as cleansing 50-51; children of God 44; the Romans and Caesar 77; the ruler of this world 89; attempts on Christ's life 112; "offending" 123 foll.; hypocrisy, not mentioned, but condemned, 121, 214; giving 26, 140; marvelling 142 foll.; sending apostles 148; bearing witness 156; joy and peace 169 foll.; John the Baptist 202; "the Jews," contrasted w. Christians 212; snatching 253; the Passover of the Jews 212, 263; three days 263; metaphors of ransoming 281; Jesus, as tempting 284-5; *paidarion* 226-26; come and ye shall see 292; the Marcan symposia 300; "superabounding," 340; that nothing be lost 241; laid 268; *diaconos* and serving at table 277; the sisters of Lazarus 280; the drawing power of the Father and the Son 424; seeing 427; hardening 440-41; the doctrine of Jesus on purification 460-62; Jesus as groaning, equiv. to (Mk) sighing 473; the raising of Lazarus, implying the Marcan *Ephphatha* 472; healing, conn. w. spitting 472; stumbling, perhaps parall. to (Mk) callousness 461; the healing of blindness 462; "Thou art the Christ" 406; the Passion as a Glorification 500; the cross, mentioned only in one passage, perhaps symbolic 509; persecution 509; judgment 512-22, a crisis or division 521; the doctrine of conviction 521; glorifying and glory 523; Christ's coming, final mention of 524
- John, words not mentioned in:—parable 12; little-ones 42, 44; wisdom 119; hypocrisy and hypocrites 121; mighty-work (*is. power*) 129; witness (masc. n.) 156; infirm 187; bowels of compassion 242; bless (except as passive participle) 219; s. also 155, 256, 400, 509
- John, the First Epistle of, continuous with the Gospel 463; three stages of belief in 27; s. also 57, 120, 247 etc.
- Jonah 61
- Joseph, in Egypt 251; sold by Judah as Jesus by Judas (Tertull.) 20; called (Philo) the bowels of Jacob 240; the bowels of, yearning for Benjamin 251
- Josephus, on:—the Essenes 161-2; Roman infantry 162-4; the Baptist's death 195-7; Eliaba bidding farewell to his home 415-16; the common, i.e. Gentile life, manner of eating etc. 446; uses *diathêkê* as meaning testament 286; avoids *diathêkê* as meaning covenant 286; s. also 265, 297
- Joshua 200, the son of Nun, a lad (Heb. *naar*) 291
- Journeying of Jesus, the 407-12, 442
- Joy and peace, more prominent in Jn than in Synoptists 168 foll.
- Judaea, ambig. 111; Galilee perhaps an error for 152-3; Judæan land,

might be explained as not Samaria or not Gentiles 151
 Judas Iscariot 128-9, 141, 414, the basketful of, Ammonius on 341; s. also 20
 Judge (vb and n.) not in Mk 520
 Judgment, in Jn 519-22; a crisis, or division 521; of this world, a 522; the saints as assessors in the day of 519; mentioned by Mk only once, about Pharisees 520
 Jurisdiction, of Antipas 405; of Pilate 406
 Justin Martyr, does not mention parable in his Apology 12-13; charges Jews with corrupting Scripture 72; adapts his vocabulary to Gentiles and Jews 206; quotes Isaiah on the Suffering Servant 124, 500; on:—the Sower 6; the works of a carpenter 122; Christ's form as *afimos* 124; new leaven 271; unleavened bread 272; the water of life 272; the assertion that Christians ate human flesh 290; infirmities healed by Jesus 470; the spiritual eye 485; s. also 126, 204, 416, 422, 427
 Juvenal, on the Jewish *cophinos* (basket) 244

Kiddush, the, Sanctification of the Sabbath 207
 Kill, in A.V. and LXX, freq. = smite in R.V. and Heb. 490
 Kindred, or land of one's k., Gk *patris* 110
 King, Herod Antipas called a 197, 201; and tetrarch 196; of Babel, the 252; the multitude purpose to make Jesus a 226; kings, the wise are (Philo) 256; regarded as shepherds 252
 Kingdom, freq. in Mt. 19; rare in Jn 254; the New 502
 Kiss, in Jewish tradition 279; three kinds of 279-80; in the Pauline Epistles 279; salute with a (Lucian) 281; c. w. arming 281; Philo on 281; of love, the 278-82; Clem. Alex. on the abuse of 279; of God, the, Moses died by 282; s. *Philēma*
Klasma, s. *Clasma*
 Know, cause to, i.e. teach, c. w. feed or shepherd (vb) 257; c. w. believe 426; c. w. see 427; "I k. and believe" (Ign.) 426; "I k. and am persuaded" 427

Koinē dialectos, the common language of the empire 440
Koinophagia, Gk, common eating, s. *Koinos*
Koinos, Gk, "common [to all, many, etc.]," but not defiled 440; thrice in canon. LXX, "common purse" etc. 440; "common hands," unique in Mk 446-50; the common life, i.e. to all Gentiles, hence (for Jews) unholy 440; common eating, i.e. unholy 440

Lad, a, with barley loaves 296-96, 212; Abraham's 228; s. *Paidarion*
 Laid, in Jn 204-6; perhaps appointed 252
 Lame of speech 470
 Lamp, Mk's single mention of 22; John the Baptist a 25, 194
 Lampetand, the holy, Philo on 26
 Last Days, the Discourse on the 162-9
 Late 261
 Law (of Moses) the, sowing the (*Err. Apoc.*) 209; and the Prophets 220; the New 422, of Purification 442 foll., and of Sacrifice 444 foll., variations in the expression of 501, dramatized in Jn 524
 Lazarus, the Raising of 100 foll., 472-4; the Synoptic silence about 105-6
 Learn, i.e. come to know, c. w. feed, shepherd (vb) 257; Jesus described as learning 400
 Leave, take leave, inadequate for *apoklassomai* 416
 Leaven, metaph. in bad sense 200; literal, not prohibited except at a stated season 210; Christ's 270, 402; conn. by Tertull. with the fire of hell 270; in a good sense, not in Talmud 271; a new (Ign. and Justin M.) 270-71; Plutarch on 272
 Legion, the number in a 75; why not mentioned by Mt. 75; transliterated into Heb. 75; ten legions (Caesar) 77; "the legions that choke you" 76
 Leisure, have not, in Gk 225; in Mk 222-7
 Levi, denying his brethren 506
 Levitical precepts, Origen on 454
 Lie [down] (vb) = to be laid, s. Laid
 Life, the fountain of 25; Jesus restoring to 24 foll.

INDEX

- Lift up, *i.e.* crucify 90
 Lift up the eyes 238, first Abrahamic instance of 238, a precept of Jesus 238, in Jn 320; lift up the head, double meaning of 90; lift up the heart, how to 375-6
 Light, heavenly, how denoted 484-5; no doctrine of, in Mk 33
 Like, Heb., before numbers, *i.e.* about, = LXX [amounting] to 340
 Literal, the, mixed with metaphorical, see Precepts to Apostles 158-69 *passim*; s. also Metaphor
 Little flock, in Lk. 255
 Little ones, not in Jn 43
 Little sheep, in Jn 356
 Living, a familiar epithet for water 300; a new epithet for bread 300
 Living voice, the, Papias on 40
 Loaf, or bread (Gk *artos*), first mention of, conn. w. a curse 305; conveyed to Jews suggestions of unity 345; one l., mentioned by Mk and Paul 211, contemplated by Jn 344, in *Acts of John* 360, we all partake of the 363; s. Bread
 Loaves, R.V. bread 213, comp. 374; not in early Fathers etc. 364; small, one for each guest 360; five 390; barley l. and Elisha 237; s. Five, and Miracles of Feeding, 203-402 *passim*
 Logos, the, the cleansing nature of, in Epict. and Jn 50-51; s. Word
 Look up, or receive insight 488; in Synopt., c. w. recover sight 320, 465; to heaven 315 foll., 320; applied to Jesus in Lk. 486
 Loosing, in prophecy and Mk 469 foll.; of Lazarus, the 474
 Lose, Gk, double meaning of 514; l. the soul, in Jn 502; lost, that nothing may be, in Jn 341
 Love (n.), Gk *agapē*, in Jn 384; a new kind of, in Jn 326-6; in Wisdom of Solomon 384; conn. w. understanding in *Hermas* 384; the kiss of 378-93; s. Kiss
 Loved, c. w. deceived 379
 Lucian, on "salute with a kiss" 381
 Luke, regards the Apostles as witnesses 156; shews traces of LXX 262
 Luke, omits:—many instances of *scandalizein* 127; (Mt.) mountains (where Lk. has desert) 234; traditions about a shepherd 252-6; *diaconos* 377; new wine, in the account of the Eucharist 394; journeyings of Christ 409-10; Caesarea 412; Marcan traditions on bread 461-2; other Marcan traditions 483; traditions about ransom 514
 Luke, on:—Christ's visits to Nazareth 112; Herodias 201; the risen Saviour, as eating 221; Bethsaida 237-40; *chorios* as grass, not hay 303; the number of the converted 361; a Petrine interrogation (not in Mk) 430; (Codex D) *phantasma* 482, (Ign.) a bodiless demon 481; alms (not in parall. Mt.) 466; purifying (diff. from parall. Mt.) 465 foll.; the "daily" taking up of the cross 509; the coming of the Lord (diff. from Mk) 523
 Lyons, Elders of the Church of 396
 Macarius, on mustard-seed 42; on two exarchs in Mt. 74; views opposed by 38, 419; s. also 91-3, 243, 419 foll.
 Machos, Heb. city etc., R.V. haven 243
 Madmen, c. w. rowing 424; conn. w. *phantasma* 483 foll.
 Magadan and Dalmanutha 243, 409, 443
 Maimed, lame, dumb, or bound 466-71
 Maimonides, on *Erubin* or communions 263-4
 Mammon 507; the yoke of 513
 Man (*homo*), as champion of humanity 517; men, the, ambig. 430
 Man of military age (*vir*), Heb. *geber* 245; a certain, *i.e.* Gabri-el 290; rendered *drēp* in Pentateuch only thrice 340; first Scriptural instance of pl. *geber* 240; s. *Geber*
 Men, *drēpes*, *i.e.* not women and children 360; two, in Lk., *i.e.* Moses and Elijah 519
 Manna 203, 225, 239, 285
 Many, freq. in Mk 226; *i.e.* the majority 232; c. w. great 267; ransom for 231; m. things, in Mk 199-200; suffer m. things 500
 Mark (a. Chapter Headings in Contents), neglected by the ancients, p. v, 439; typical and allusive meanings in 467; new words in 247, 420; signs of conflation in 242-4, 518; does not aim at variety 415; attitude of, toward Gentiles in traditions about bread 483; traces of Petrine tradition in 21; mentions lamp (metaph.) but no

doctrine of light 33; has man
parall. to Mt. householder 36; joy
and peace latent in 103-9, 503;
omits baptizing in the Precepts to
the Twelve 136; eye (sing.)
metaph. in 459; s. Conflation
Mark, on:—one loaf 311; many 326;
ransom for many 331; the boat
241-2
Market-place, R.V. haven 243; in
fields (?) 443
Martha, serving [at table] 377; s.
Diaconos
Marius, Gk, a witness, or martyr,
not in Jn 156
Martyr, p. xiii, 156; martyrs, Jewish
453
Martyrdom, Origen and Tertullian
on the fruit of 30; the passion for
505
Martyrological phrases 511
Marvelling, attributed to Jesus 143,
and to God 144; deprecated by
philosophers 143; used in a bad
sense by Jn 143; explained as
implying silence 144
Materialistic, the multitude regarded
as 534
Matthew, mentions two demoniacs
where Mk-Lk. has one 70, and two
blind men where Mk-Lk. has one
465; has householder parall. to
Mk man 36; omits legion 75; has
mountains parall. to Lk. desert
234; mentions Peter, not in
parall. Mk 421; differs from parall.
Lk. as to purifying 465 foll., and
as to metaphor 455-6; on king-
dom 19; on retribution 505-6
Meal, Jewish, the father of the
family at a 375
Meats, s. Foods
Medinah, Heb., province or city
87-8, 110
Megalopolis, a 243
Meir, R., attitude of, toward the
Sabbath 181-2; a kind action of
469; on "a denarius of fire" 377
Men, s. Man
Mercury or Hermes, the sandals of
167
Messenger, Moses a 233; Abraham's
233
Messiah, the, called the Nail 164; a
captain over fifty 311; regarded
as sighing 472-3; cakes in the
days of 324; meaning of the title,
to Jesus 469
Metaphor, first-century misunder-
standings of 336-9, 401; mystical,

called tropology (Origen) 64;
obscure 33; varied 166, 281;
poetic 307; military 313; in the
Precepts to the Twelve 146-57;
traces of, in the narratives about
baskets 309 foll.; of ransoming
or buying 331; of thirsty garden-
beds 396; of the vineyard in
Jabneh, taken by some as literal
399; of purification 440; illus-
trating regeneration 373; in Mt.
but not in Lk. 455-6; mixed with
non-metaphor 59, 70, 155 foll.,
171-2, 175 foll., 184-5, 416, 456-8
Michael 530
Midbar, Heb., (1) any open country,
(2) the desert of Sinai 225; c. w.
Aram. take 238
Military, age, man of 349; m.
metaphor 313
Minister, s. *Diaconos*, Servant
Miracles (*kt.* powers), revolutionary
333; in Synoptists, are signs in
Jn 140; of feeding 303-403 *passim*;
s. also Chapter Headings in Con-
tents
Miriam, died by God's kiss 332
Mishna, called the mysteries of God
17, 30; on:—entering the Mount
of the Temple 171; washing be-
fore eating 446, 450; Corban 451;
common food 448; s. *Chullin*
Mission of the Twelve, the first 151
Mixing, *i.e.* communion 333
Modius, a Hebraized word 34
Moment of time, c. w. plague 100
Money, a girdle for 173
Moored to the shore, in Mk 448
Moses, God's *Sheliach* or apostle 233,
238; remonstrates with God
("Whence to me...?") 370; is
shewn a denarius of fire 377; is
signified by the "lad" in Jn
(Jerome) 390, 318; died by God's
kiss 332
Mount, of the Temple, the 171
Mountain, conn. w. Jesus 407;
mountains in Mt., parall. to
desert in Lk. 234
Mulcted, in one's soul or mind
(Synopt. and Philo) 514
Multitude(s), the 415, 534
Mustard-seed, a grain of, faith as,
how explained 43
Muzzled or dumb, in Targum 470-71;
c. w. lamed 471
Mystery, a Hebraized word 16; in
Gk and Heb. 16; of the seal, the
267; the hardening of Israel a 6;
of the kingdom, the 15; the m.

INDEX

- that is the head of all things 46;
mysteries of Eleusis, the 16;
mysteries, some attacked by
Philo but others praised 29
- Naar*, Heb., lad 227; might also
imply service 291; first Biblical
instance of 227-8, interpr. in O.T.
as Ishmael 228; of Moses as
"babe" 228; s. *Paidarion*
- Nail, c. w. peg, shovel, arms 163
foll.; i.e. the Messiah 163-4;
nails, the three, i.e. Abraham,
Isaac, and Jacob 164
- Name, i.e. n. of the Lord 128; Heb.,
c. w. oil 128; of God, the, unity
of 508
- Names, Synoptic, avoided by Jn
124, 240
- Napkin, about Christ's head, the 64
- Nathanael 18
- Natural religion 407 foll.
- Nature, Philo on 29; good or bad in
man, Heb. *yetzer* 372; God in 372;
(Epict.) drawing man 423
- Naught, set at, in Isaiah (Sym.),
Mk, and Lk. 125
- Nazareth 109 foll., 153
- Nearing, they see Jesus n. 423
- Negatives, as distinct from positives,
avoided by Jn 214
- Nero 202
- New, in the accounts of the Euchar-
ist 392-3, om. in Lk. (shorter txt)
392-4; n. commandment, in Jn
and 1 Jn 295; n. eye 423; n.
kingdom 502; the New Law 453,
of Purification 442 foll., of Sacri-
fice 424 foll., variously expressed
501
- New words in Mk 247, 420, comp. 125
- Nicodemus, the dialogue with 9-10,
40
- Night, fourth watch of the 412-22,
427; hours of the, differently
reckoned 419
- Nineveh 23
- Noah, the covenant with 225; the
equivalent, or successor, of perish-
ed humanity 515
- Non-causes 524
- Non-defilement, the doctrine of
412-13
- Non-intervention, Johannine, in
matters affecting John the Baptist
219; in Synoptic names 240
- Non-metaphor, c. w. metaphor 456;
s. Metaphor
- Nonnus, on:—reclining on the hay
202; "not even Peter" ventured
to say "who art thou?" 425;
Jesus making clay 420; s. also
50, 241, 227, 247, 269
- North and South 230
- North Palestine, Jesus in 407-13
- Not, Heb., c. w. to him 294
- Number, in Lk. and Jn 251; num-
bers, treated symbolically in
Midrash 222
- Numbering, of Israel, ten occasions
of 250; perhaps differently re-
garded by Lk. and Jn 251; first
instance of 251; the seed of
Abraham cannot be numbered 251
- Oath, of Herod Antipas, the 196-7
- Obscurity, a necessity in Christ's
teaching, p. viii; in an earlier
writer, explained by a later 20
- Obvious interpretations, Origen's
warning against 454
- Odes of Solomon*, the 15, 114
- Oedipodean intercourse, imputed to
Christians 226
- Offend, i.e. cause to stumble 125-6;
not in Gk literature 125; not used
actively in LXX 125; in Synop-
tists 124-7; in Jn 126-23; in Mk,
passive, parall. to apostatize in
Lk. 127; in Aram., has two Heb.
meanings 126; s. *Scandalisin*
- Offspring of the vine, the 294
- Oil, anointing with 175 foll.; curing
with, Tertullian on 177; in Heb.,
c. w. name 123
- Old, new and, in 1 Jn 225
- Old Testament, s. First Biblical
Mention
- Omma*, Gk, eye 425; in LXX only in
Prov. 425; in Gk literature means
the eye of the soul 425; in N.T.
only conn. w. the healing of blind-
ness 425; o. and *ophthalmos* 425
- Omophagias*, Gk, eatings of raw
flesh, Christians suspected of 299;
described by Plutarch and Clem.
Alex. 299
- One loaf, in Mk and Paul 211; con-
templated by Jn 244; in *Acts of
John* 260; we all partake of the
222 foll.
- Onkelos, on God's going down 522
- Only begotten son, implying unique-
ly beloved 250; s. Bowels
- Opening, lit. and metaph. 226; o.
the Scriptures 226; be thou
opened, implies a prison 471,
472; s. *Ephphatha*

Oppressed (LXX), first mention of 473

Ophthalmos and *omma*, Gk, eye 485

Order, chronological 55, 263

Origen, on :—those who sow 7; the censurers of Corah 18; "our Joseph" 20; "sendeth his word" 21; the harvest in heaven 25; the fruit from martyrs 29; faith as a grain of mustard-seed 42; Jesus, as appearing differently to the disciples and to the multitudes 46; the delivering up of Jesus 56; the sleeping of the Divine Word 59; Johannine "tropology" 64; eponymous place-names 71; bodies that are tombs 73; Gergesenes, fellow-citizens of swine 83; Abraham's country 87; the raising of Lazarus 103; Christ's country 110; Jesus, not called a carpenter 121; desire, a neutral term 123; *alimos* 123; Christ's being "not able" 127; the *sumptaris* or co-operation of faith 128; the claim of certain heretics to more than priestly power 177; sin unto death, and confession of sins 177-9; the infirm 184-5; the word *epiousios*, not in existence before the Lord's Prayer 204; the Jews, not knowing how to purify themselves 212; those who refresh themselves with the nourishment of Jesus 220; the Saviour, wiping off defilement 223, 462; the Four Thousand, and three days 267; the five loaves and the two fishes 290-91; lying down in (*sic*) the grass 303; ranks of the Five Thousand 310; blessing God 319; broken pieces of bread 325; he that cheweth my bread 346; the 5000 in the Acts 353-4; "give ye them to eat" 355-6; offspring of the vine, Christ's blood 394; the boat distressed 424-5; the boat of temptations 425; swimming through trials 425; the [men] in the boat 429; parables 454; "the obvious," contrasted with "the appointed scope" 454; Levitical precepts 454; true self-purification 453; invisible persecutors 503; "for the sake of the Gospel" 511; the equivalent, or exchange, for a man's soul 512-13; Christ's Coming 522-3; s. also 10, 22-3, 31, 33, 43, 64, 70, 101, 155, 220, 274, 286, 409, 460, 466, 483

Originality of Christ's thought 274

Other, Gk, c. w. "but" 60

Ought, how expr. in Heb. 273

Outside, in Jn 29, 91; down substituted for 91; c. w. that which is o. 458; o. the country in Mk 26; o. oneself (Philo) 483

Outstripping and running to and fro 231

Owe, p. ix

Paidarion, Gk, freq. = Heb. *naar*, lad 287-8; in Jn "there is a l. here" 296-98, unique in N. T. 297, interpr. by Jerome as Moses 290; rare in early Christian writers 297; s. *Naar*

Pairs, the Apostles said to be sent out in 158

Papias, on the living voice 49; on sayings of Andrew, Philip, and Thomas 223

Parable, the word, used in Justin Martyr's *Dialogus* but not in *Apology* 12-13; rare in early Fathers 12; in Hermas sometimes means paradox 12; Jn substitutes proverb for, p. vii, 13; Peter blamed by Jerome and Chrys. for using 464

Parables, Christ's 1-6; of Sowing, the 1-59; "asking the p." 10 foll.

Paraclete, the, meaning of the term 78, 165; a personal testament 397

Páras, Heb., break in half, R.V. "deal thy bread" 323; v.r. *páras* separate, or spread out and explain 323-4

Páras, Heb., spread out the hands in blessing, or separate Scripture into sections 324

Parentheses, freq. in Jn 62

Parents, duty of children to 451

Paroimía, Gk, *i.s.* proverb, Jn's substitute for parable 12, comp. p. vii

Partitive use of "from," *i.s.* some of 226-7

Parts, *i.s.* regions 242; c. w. villages 467

Paschal Lamb, first mention of the 340

Passion, of Jesus, the, a glorifying 500, 510

Passionateness, of the Eucharist, the 375, 378, 399

"Passover of the Jews, the," in Jn 212, 263; Origen on 213

INDEX

- Patris*, Gk. = Heb. kindred, or land of one's kindred 109 foll.
- Paul, uses military metaphor 313; on *diathēkē* 390-91; s. also 57, 441 etc.
- Peace, Epict. on 503; seldom in Mk 503; of Jesus, the 504; conditional 504; the condition of, is self-sacrifice 505; p. and joy, more prominent in Jn than in the Synoptists 163-9
- Peniel, Jacob the wrestler at 183
- Penitence, s. Repentance
- Pennyworth, two hundred 274-63
- Pentecost, (Philo) conn. w. the square of seven 343
- Perfect tense, the, combined with aorist 353
- Perfection, a hundred the symbol of 303
- Perplexed, to be, prob. an error 192; c. w. to pose 199
- Perplexity, of Herod Antipas, the 198
- Persecution, Jn on 509
- Persecutors, invisible, Origen on 503
- Peter, a martyr or witness, p. xiii; the voice from heaven to (in Acts) 412; the vision of "a sheet" to (in Acts) 452-3; the denial of, reference to 420; the merit of the confession of 406-7 foll.; tested [and tormented] 425; grieved by Jesus 426-7; in Lk. but not in Mk 420; in Mt. but not in Mk 431; (?) called a stumbling-block in Mt. 120, 501; said to have denied and confessed near a coal-fire 363; blamed by Jerome and Chrys. for using the word parable 454; "not even Peter ventured to ask..." (Nonnus) 435
- Petrine reminiscences or speeches 31, 201, 420, 471
- Phagein*, Gk. eat, interch. by Jn with *trōgein* 347
- Phantasiā*, Gk. in Epict. 423-4
- Phantasma*, Gk. various meanings or interpretations of 58, 430-34; Chrysippus' definition of 431, 433; Pliny on 431
- Pharaoh, the type of an oppressor 76
- Pharisees, definition of 443; s. also 451
- Philēma*, Gk. kiss, and *philiā*, Gk. love, Philo on 331
- Philip the Apostle, the character of 273, 281-2; sayings of, Papias on 333
- Philip (Herod) 494
- Philip the Tetrarch 405; diff. from Herod Philip 494
- Philippi, Caesarea, so called from Philip the Tetrarch 494
- Philo, attacks disreputable initiations and mysteries 29; distinguishes shepherds from cattle-feeders 254-5, blessed (particip.) from blessed (adj.) 319, and *philēma*, kiss, from *philiā*, love 331; rarely quotes prophecy 329; on:—the sun and the holy lamp-stand 38; Isaac's finding (not reaping) 33-9; things automatic and natural 39; Abraham's country 37; the seducer who acts through the five senses 133; Jacob's staff 159; the Essenes 161 foll., 183; the nail or shovel 164; the Feast of the Baskets 306, 343; the salt at the meals of the Essenes 321; "the Lord is my shepherd" 353; the sacrifice of Isaac 365; the third day 265-6; the *symposia* of the Therapeutae 297-8, 313, 361; grass and green [grass] 306; "taking" for God 316; the unity of the whole burnt offering 322-3; the square of seven and the eve of Pentecost 343; the four pillars and the five 354; three measures of meal 373; *diathēkai*, covenants or testaments 387-8; God as a *diathēkē* 388; God, the most ancient of all fountains 400; *epolassomai* 415; Abraham, bidden to look up 464, 483; the eye (*omma*) of the soul 465; bringing out outside 483; Levi denying his brethren 506; s. also 31, 249-50, 253, 423, 483, 490, 507, 514
- Physical, the, c. w. the spiritual 133, or moral 136
- Physicians, Ben Sira on 181
- Pilate, jurisdiction of 405-8
- Pillow 63-4; s. Cushion
- Pistis Sophia*, the 43
- Plague or stroke, c. w. moment 100
- Plato, blamed for never grieving a disciple 429; followed by Philo and Justin Martyr 465; on:—*mýthos* and *logos* 23; the sun 26; testing as if by torment 422; s. also 11, 167, 453
- Pliny, acquits Christians that cursed Christ 180; defines *phantasma* 431
- Pluperfect tense, c. w. aorist 183, 463, 440; want of, in Heb. 433

Plural, c. w. singular 82, 469
 Plutarch, quotes Chrysippus on *phantasma* and "drawing" 431, 433, quotes Diogenes to the effect that a teacher must "grieve" his pupils 439; on:—the deprecation of marvelling by Pythagoras 143; brass rusted by lightning 173; grass, not dry but green 306; leaven 373; *ōmophagias* 390; progressors as swimmers 435; s. also 61, 307
 Poetry, narratives of the nature of 59; traces of, in Mk's healing of the blind 404-6, comp. 469
 Polycarp, the martyrdom of 399
 Poor, giving to the 390
Pōrōsis, *pōrous*, hardening, callousness, various kinds of 479-80; in Mk, Jn, and Paul 441
 Positives, as distinct from negatives, Jn dwells on 314
 Possible things, Epict. declines to discuss 133; Jn's attitude towards 139
 Post-resurrectional, acts and words of Christ 14, 374; possibly antedated 46, 52-3, 186-7, 307, 323, 423, 441; recognition of Jesus 435, Chrysostom and Nonnus on 435
 Power, in one's p., c. w. inside 457
 Powers, "these p. work in him," in Mk-Mt. 193-4; meaning "miracles," equiv. to "signs" in Jn 140
Prasid, Gk. *lit.* greenery, and hence garden-bed 396; *prasiai*, in Mk 396-391; garden-beds thirsting for rain, Jerome on 396; equiv. to, in Jn, if any 301
 Prayer, in behalf of the sick 175 foll.; for bread, the 303 foll.; conn. w. Jesus 407
 Preaching, to the spirits in prison 58, 70
 Precepts, to the Twelve, the 146-87; literal or metaphorical 170 foll.; regarded as gifts 396; the yoke of 508
 Precipitation, the Rock of 117
 Present imperative, implying continuous action 304
 Priestly power, more than, Origen on 177
 Priests 451
 Prince, of this world, the 89; s. Ruler
 Prison, the spirits in 58, 70; Sin or Egypt a 472; sighing in the 472
 Private expounding by Jesus 45; Jn's attitude towards 47

Profane or unholy (A.V.) = common (R.V.) 446; s. Common
 Pronoun, s. They
 Proofs, Thucydidean 438
 Proper names, Synoptic, avoided by Jn 124, 240
 Prophecy, influence of, s. Hosea, Isaiah
 Prophet, a term applied to Jesus 406
 Prophets, the 290, 318
 Proselyte, a, new-born 460
 Prove, test, or try 325; by fire 423
 Proverb, in Jn, = parable in the Synoptists, p. vii, 13
 Province or city 87; p. and marketplace 443
 Provisioning, Heb. *saida*, Gk. *epistismos* 337-40; s. Bethsaida
 Psalms, the 290, 318
 Pseudo-Jerome, s. Jerome
 Punishment, the Angel of, in Hermas 433
 Pure and impure, things 458
 Purifier, the 460
 Purifying, the New Law of 443 foll.; Christ's doctrine on 455 foll., 461; the new and the old 463; two Gk verbs for 461-3; "p. all foods" 453
 Purse, lit. or metaph. 170 foll.
 Pursued (?) by righteousness (Clem. Alex.) 511
 Pythagoras, deprecates marvelling 143
 Q, a name given to the Double Tradition of Matthew and Luke 125, 373
 Quadratus 353
Quincunx 311, 314
 Quotation, deviations in 6, 346, 409 etc.
 Rachel 380
 Raising, ambig., morally or physically 178, 183
 Ranks, of the Five Thousand, in Mk 396; Origen on 310; s. *Prasiai*
 Ransom 515, for the soul, the, revealed to Moses 377, 390, a denarius of fire 377, riches, or almsgiving 378; tradition about, om. by Lk. 514; for many, a 331; s. Exchange
 Ransomed, the, return of the 304
 Raphael 330
 Rashi, on:—"with my staff" 159; Abraham's recompence 323; "this

INDEX

- shalt thou give" 377; breaking [bread] 324; s. also *passim*
 Raw or living flesh, the Christians accused of eating 308 foll., s. *Omophagiai*
 Real-and-true, *alēthinos*, c. w. true, *alēthēs* 23, comp. 50
 Receiving Jesus 55
 Recognition of Jesus, post-resurrectional 435
 Recoil of disciples, in Mk but not in Mt.-Lk. 461, Jn intervenes as to 461
 Recompensing, of Abraham, the 328 foll., 326
 Recover sight, c. w. look up 330
 Redeemed, the 264, comp. 469; redeeming the dying, Irenaeus on 177; s. Ransom
 Reduplicated article, the, rare in Synoptists 818
 Refresh oneself, with food, Origen on 230
 Regeneration, in Jn 9-10; metaphors of 373; s. also 42-4
 Rejection, the drama of 465; anticipation of 469; s. *Alimos*
 Religion, natural 467
 Remnant or superabundance 338
 Renounce, *apolassomai* 416
 Repentance, fifty the symbol of (Jerome) 303, 310-11; applied to God 473
 Report (n.), or fame 193
 Rest (n.), under Christ's yoke 219
 Rest (vb), in Gk, refresh [with food] 230; "come and r." might mean come and break your fast 219-23
 Resurrection, for Israel (Hosea) 266; sons of the 520; Christ's, events placed before or after 46; s. Post-resurrectional
 Retribution, the Law of 76-7; in Mt. 505
 Return of the Captives, the, in Isaiah 264, Mk alludes to 468-71
 Riches, the ransom of man's soul 278
 Riddles 4-8
 Righteousness, a name for almsgiving 279; c. w. alms 456
 Rise, s. Arise
 Rod, and staff, Jerome on 160; s. Staff
 Romans, the, Jn on 77
 Rose, Israel compared to a 30
Rōsh, Heb., head or ruler 97; s. *Jaīrus*
 Round about, c. w. swine 88
 Rowing, c. w. running to and fro 244-5; in Gk may mean driving 424; Heb. *lit.* "moving to and fro" may mean in Aram. "mad" 424
 Ruler of this world, the 39
 Run away, Adam and Eve, from God (Philo) 507; running away from God is fleeing into oneself (Philo) 507
 Runaway, a, denying his master (Epict.) 507
 Run to and fro, in Daniel and Mk 230, 244; c. w. row 244-5
 Sabaoth, Lord of 189
 Sabbath, the hallowing of the 207, 204; remember the, over the wine 204
 Sacrifice (n.), kindness and not 362-3; better than 363; the new law of 464 foll.; s. *Eucharistiā* (Aquila)
 Sacrifice (vb) 363
 Said, or used to say, ambig. 291
Saida, Heb., provision, in *Beth Saida*, House of Provisioning 238
 Saints, s. Holy
 Sake, for the, of the Gospel, in Mk 511
 Salt, at the meals of the Essenes 221; a covenant of 221
 Salted, with fire 373; be ye s. in Him (Ign.) 373
 Salute [for the last time] 416; s. *Apolassomai*
 Samaritans, "not S." 151
 Samaritan woman, the, and the Syrophoenician 467; and Hagar 35, 460-61
Sandalon, a Hebraized word for sandal, with various meanings 163
 Sandals, shod with 167 foll.; of Mercury, the 167
 Sanhedrin, the, on the washing of hands 447
 Sarepta of Sidonia 409, comp. 468
 Satan, and Hades 75; regarded as binding 471; "Get thee behind me, S." 468, c. w. "Art thou going after S.?" 500-501
 Save, c. w. heal 176
 Say, *i. s.* command 96; used to say, c. w. said 231
 Saying (n.) interch. w. word 23
Scandaliscin, Gk, *i. s.* cause to stumble, not in Gk literature and only once in LXX 125; in Aram. = two Heb. words 126
Scandalon, Gk, stumbling-block, in LXX = two Heb. nouns 126; there is no s. in him 120

Schism, in Jn 118
 Scrip, conn. w. staff 161; or wallet 160; lit. or metaph. 170 foll.
 Scriptures, opening the 336
 Sea, Jesus walking on the 403-41; by the 409; from s. to s. 330
 Seal, the, of baptism, the mystery of 367
 Season, i.e. leisure 235; have no good s. 233-6
 Secret, of God, the 16
 See, the Lord, interch. w. appear before the Lord 466; saw, in Jerome, = Gk know 457
 "See, come (or, go) and," conn. w. symbolism 239, 292 foll., w. barley loaves 292
 Seeing, metaph. 22; in Jn 437; s. the kingdom of God 534; s. out of darkness, Ibn Ezra on 492; thou art a God of s. 461
 See-with-insight, Gk, construction with 468
 Seed, the blood of Christians said to be 39; s. Mustard-seed
 Self, the lower, he that runs away from God flees into 507; the true 514
 Self-purification 461-3; two Gk words for 461, 463
 Self-sacrifice, the Law of 464-536, comp. 27, 30, 267, 309, 510
 Self-worship, implied in hardness of heart 460
 Sending of Apostles, Jn on 146-51
 "Separation," of Scripture into sections 234
 Septuagint, the, amplifies for clearness 30; on *diathēkē*, covenant 335-61; paraphrases 469-70 etc.
 Servant, i.e. bondservant, a *Doulos*
 Servant or young man (Heb. *na'ar*) 238
 Servant [at table] 377; s. *Diaconos*
 Service, filial, the yoke of 508
 Set ye for yourselves (Heb.) = set your hearts on (Targ.) 308-9
 Seven, mystically explained 255; seven baskets, loaves, churches 275; s. *Sphurides*; seven disciples, the feeding of 222, 235, and that of Elijah 317
 Seventy (or, seventy-two) missionaries, the 154, 221
 Severus, the Emperor, "cured by oil" 177
Shābar, Heb., buy [mostly corn] 272; first used of corn in Egypt 272
Shad, Heb., demon 423
 Shaddai 139

Shadow, in Heb. poetry 30
 Shammai 160; and Hillel 394, 447
 Shechinah, the, seen by Abraham and Isaac 366
 Sheep, not having a shepherd 252-6; Jerome on the wandering 255; little, in Jn 256; three classes of 259
 Shekel, or stater 230; half-shekel, the 230
Sheliach, Heb., i.e. one sent, or apostle, Moses a 233
 Sheol, Descent into, the 59; s. *Descensus*
 Shepherd (n.), the scrip of a 160 foll.; metaph. in Mk-Mt. and Gk literature but not in Lk. 252-6; a king as a 252; the compassionate 260; the Lord is my s., Jewish comments on 258-9; shepherds, diff. from cattle-feeders (Philo) 254; Moses and David as 259
 Shepherding, aspects of, in Lk. and Jn 256; includes feeding, guiding, tending 256-7; is more than redeeming 258; c. w. knowing or teaching 257
 Shod, with sandals 167 foll.
 Shoes, in the four Gospels 167
Sibylline Oracles, the, on *Ichthus* 235
 Sick, anointing the 175 foll.; praying over the 175 foll.; s. Heal
 Sickness, physical and spiritual 182, comp. 180
 Sidon, c. w. Sidonia 468; perhaps derived from O.T. 463; through S., in Mk, om. by Mt. 409, 467-8
 Sidonia, Sarepta of, the widow in 463; Origen on 409, comp. 468
 Sighing, of Jesus, the first 467, the second 474; of prisoners 472; of Israel 259, 472; of Ezekiel, son of man 472; shall flee away 473
 Sight, recover 465, c. w. look up 230, 465
 Sign, from heaven, a, the demand for 474; the meaning of 475-8; signs, first Biblical mention of 140; in Jn, = miracles (*lit.* powers) in Synoptists 140
 Signs, "make s.," c. w. swim 52, 116, 426
 Silence, and marvelling 144
 Simon Magus, on mustard-seed 43
 Simon Peter, s. Peter
 Sin, Egypt the prison of 472; against the light 372; unto death, Origen on 179; confession of, Origen on 179

INDEX

- Sinai, the wilderness of 225; the *diathēke* of 391, 393
 Sinaitic Syrian Codex, the, readings of 115, 226, 435-6, 438 etc.
 Single, and singleness, of eye or heart 337
 Singular, c. w. plural 82, 218, 469
 Sister, my, in Mk, om. by Lk. 330; Martha and her s., in Jn 331
 Sitting down, with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob 258
 Six hundred thousand, the, in Exodus and Numbers 340; Jewish tradition about 240-50
 Slavery, to Mammon 507
 Sleeping, of the Divine Word, the (Origen) 59; *i.e.* torpor 185; *i.e.* death 101
 Smite, Heb., ambig. 409; = kill freq. in LXX 409; God described as smiting Israel 409
 Smith, the, or son of the, a name given to a Rabbi 121
 Snatching, Jn and Paul on 253
 Socrates 33, 107; "Go and look at S." (Epict.) 424
 Soldiers, Roman, Josephus on 163-4
 Some, in Lk., om. in parall. Mk-Mt. 475; some of, implied by "from" 336; some one (LXX)=angel (Heb.) 317
 Sometimes, insertion of, necessary 185
 Son of David 405
 Son of Man, why chosen as Christ's self-appellation 405; the, regarded as sighing 472-3
 Son, the, speaks as a Testator 397
 Sons of the resurrection 530
 Soul, in two senses, ambig. 514
 South, North and 230
 Sower, the 5 foll., 17
 Sowing, the parables of 1-51; first Biblical mention of 38; of the Law, the 209
 Speech, reported 99
 Speechless or dumb 469; s. Stuttering
Sphuridos, Gk, the baskets in the Feeding of the Four Thousand 206, 342, 344, 483; called the Seven Churches 343, 375
 Spirit, or wind, ambig. 9, 424; "his s. returned," ambig. 100; *i.e.* apparition or phantasm 430-32; s. *Phantasma*; spirits in prison 58, 70
 Spiritual healing, c. w. physical 123
 Spitting, in his face, interpr. as before his face 469, and hence on the ground 469; to heal blindness, in Mk and Jn 464 foll.; in Mk in the face, but in Jn on the ground 469; subordinated in Jn to "making clay" 463
 Spread out [the hands in blessing], Heb., c. w. break 323-4
 Sprinkle, v. r. baptize 443
 SS, s. Sinaitic Syrian
 Staff, a, in Mk 158 foll.; in LXX, three Heb. words 160; conn. w. scrip 161; Jacob's, allegorized by Philo 169; in Heb. and Aram. 160
 Stages in healing 465
 Stammerer, the, in Isaiah (LXX) and Mk 264
Stater or shekel 290
 Stephen, the Martyr, or *martus* 156
 Stoic doctrine, about "cleansing the vessel" 457; about *phantasma* 434; Jn perhaps influenced by 434
 Stoning in the Temple 118
 Strong drink 185
 Stumble, cause to (A.V. offend), s. *Scandalizein*
 Stumbling, at the Law of self-sacrifice 129; different kinds of 130; in Jn, perhaps parall. to callousness in Mk 461 foll.; s. *Scandalizein*, *Scandalon*
 Stumbling-block, s. *Scandalon*
 Stuttering (LXX), only in the Return of the Captives (Isaiah) 264, 469; in N.T. only in Mk 264, 469; in Aquila etc. 470; c. w. maimed or lame 470
 Subjunctive, deliberative 273
 Suetonius, on the Christians 296
 Suffer many things 500
 Suffering Servant, the 123-7, 500
 Suffice, in Jn, rare in LXX and Gospels 270
Sumpraxis, Gk, co-operation, human, needed for Christ's healing (Origen) 137-8
 Sun, the, and the holy lampstand in Philo 35
Sunthēkē, Gk, Aquila's rendering of *berith*, covenant, LXX *diathēkē* 356
 Superabound, ambig. 323-9; they shall cause to s. 323; ye shall cause none of it to s. 340
 Superabundance or remnant 323; Jn's view of 240; conn. w. first mention of the Paschal Lamb 240
 Sustaining Power, the 166
 Swim, 426-8, c. w. make-signs 52, 116, 426

Swimmers, Plutarch on progressors
as 425

Swimming through trials, Origen on
425

Swine, c. w. go round 85, 88; the
flesh of 463; s. Gergesenes

Symbolism, indicated by one loaf
211; lift up the eyes 228; "come
(or go) [and] see" 223; fire of
coals 368; s. Metaphor, Seven

Symposia, Gk, lit. drinking-parties,
in Mk 296; might imply thirst in
Mk 297-8; how expressed by Jn
300-301; of the water-drinking
Therapeutae, the 297, contrasted
by Philo with others 297-8

Synoptists, the silence of about
Lazarus 105; the only mention
of buying in 215; the thoughts
of, expressed in Johannine words
510

Syrophenician woman, the 464-6;
the story of, Jn perhaps influenced
by 466; and the Samaritan
woman 466-7

Tabea, s. *Talitha*

Tabitha 182

Table, serve at, in Jn 377; s.
Diaconess

Tacitus, on the Christians 296

Take, i.e. receive a person 55; to
take (Aram.) c. w. wilderness 228;
t. ritually 315 foll., 367; "t. for
me a heifer" 316, explained by
Philo 316

Talitha, or *Tabea* 98

Talmud, the, on:—excommunica-
tion 180; Rabbis and Roman
Emperors 199; captains of fifths,
i.e. the five sections of the Law
211; deal thy bread to the hungry
322-4; the washing of hands 447;
Corban 461; nowhere mentions
leaven in good sense 271

Targum 470-71, amplifies for clear-
ness 20; alters "see the Lord"
466; avoids anthropomorphism
523

Teaching, c. w. boat 241; might be
expressed by shepherding 256-7;
in Heb., causing to know, c. w.
shepherding 257

Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, the
264; s. *Didachē*

Technical terms, avoided by Jn,
p. viii, 319; conn. w. the washing
of hands 447 foll.

Temple, stoning in the 118; the

Mount of the 171; the gold of
the 451

Temptations, the boat of (Origen)
425

Tempting, first Biblical instance of
285; for good 268; Jesus unique-
ly described as 284-5

Tertullian, compares Christ to
Joseph 20; connects leaven with
the oven of hell 370, 372; on:—
the blood of Christians as seed 29;
curing by oil 177; *phantasma* 431;
charges against the Christians
400; s. also 46, 450

Test, try, or prove 225; test [as if by
torment], applied to Peter 425, to
sailors or vessels 421, 425; testing
by fire and by water 422

Testament, last will and, or cove-
nant, Gk *diathēkē* 384-91; in the
Gospels 292-7; a self-bequeathing
297

Testator, the Son speaks as a 297

Testify and testimony, s. Witness

Tetrarch, and king 198

Thanks, give, Gk *eucharistein* (Four
Thousand and Jn) corresponds to
bless (*eulogēin*) (Five Thousand,
Synopt.) 315, comp. 319; s.
Eucharistein

The, s. Article

Therapeia, Gk, attendance, ambig.
414

Therapeutae, the, Philo on the
symposia of 297, 312, 343, 361;
drink only running water 296

Therapeutic and iatric healing 184-
5, comp. 460

They, ambig. 429, variously interpr.
by Mk and Mt. 443; them, ambig.
415; [they] ambig. 80, 218, 226,
237

Thing, Heb. *dābār*, =also word 208

Think, "they thought," conn. w.
phantasm or spirit 422

Third day and three days 225, 263,
265-8; conn. w. perfection 266-7;
third watch, the 419

Thirst, spiritual 200

Thirsting like a garden-bed 298

This generation, i.e. this evil g. 477;
this world, a judgment of 523

Thomas, the Apostle, sayings of,
Papias on 262

Thousand, Heb., c. w. chief 74

Three, angelic visitors to Abraham
228, 226; classes of sheep 259;
classes of fruit-bearers 27; aspects
of a shepherd 259; measures of
meal, Philo and Clem. Alex. on

INDEX

- 373; three days and third day
 225, 263, 265-8
 Threefold cord, a 157
 Thucydidean proofs 436
 Thunder, in Jn 10, 523-4
 Thyestean banquets, imputed to
 Christians 398-9
 Till (R.V.), an error for while; in
 N.T. not combined with an in-
 dicative 525
 Timeless nature of the third day,
 the, Philo on 266
 To and fro, running 230-31
 To-day, Heb., c. w. a day 304-5
 To him, Heb., c. w. not 294
 Tombs, in the Gospels 59; bodies
 that are 73
 Tormented, lit. and metaph. 431-5;
 s. *Basanizein*
 Tradition, Papias on 49, 232
 Trampling on the flowers 303
 Transfiguration, the 519, 523
 Transposition 98, 309
 Trees, men as 438
 Trial, the hour of 430
Trôgein, Gk, chew or eat, only once
 in Gk Bible exc. Jn 345; Johan-
 nine use of 345-7
 Tropology, Johannine, Origen on 64
 True, c. w. real-and-true 23, comp.
 50; s. *Alêthês*, *Alêthinos*
 Truth, grace and 26, 120, 318
 Twelve, the, Precepts to 148-57; t.
 baskets, the 326 foll.; t. years,
 variously applied 98; t. hours in
 the day 123; s. Apostles
 Two, once in O.T. = "a few" 230-31;
 in Mt. but not in Mk-Lk. 70, 74;
 t. demoniacs in Mt. and t. thou-
 sand swine in Mk 74; t. fishes,
 the, Jerome and Origen on 290-
 91; t. and t., applied to apostles,
 in Mk 155; t. witnesses, s. Two-
 fold; t. seasons (Philo) for the
 Feast of Baskets 343; t. are better
 than one 157
 Two hundred, pennyworth 274-63;
 denars, an income of 274-5; in
 Gk, c. w. five thousand 276
 Twofold, witness 158; apostolic
 action 158
 Typical narrative, may be historical
 467
 Tyre and Sidon 463, comp. 408

 Understanding, conn. w. love in
 Hermas 334
 Unholy (A.V.), error for common
 (R.V.) 448

 Unique words, in N.T. 5, 239, 274,
 287, 460 etc., comp. 37, 46, 63 foll.;
 in the Gk Bible 242-4, 250, comp.
 74, 117, 264
 Unity, of the Eucharistic food, the,
 Johannine view of 323; of the
 Name of God 508
 Unleavened 310; s. Leaven
 Unpopularity of Jesus, temporary
 405, 411
 Until, c. w. while 414
 Uplift, s. Liit
 Upright, go 516
 Ur of the Chaldeans 87

 Verus, the persecution under 290
 Vessel, cleanse the (Epict.) 457; of
 the soul, the body 458; of thought,
 the soul 458; the only pure v. is
 the Purifier 460
 Viaticum, for the work of the Gospel
 423
 Vicarious, s. Ransom
 Victor of Antioch, on Mark, p. v.,
 439; s. also 158, 444, 453, 466,
 478-9 etc.
 Village, c. w. city 233, 467; a v. of,
 c. w. a v. named 467; v. in LXX
 =seven diff. Heb. words 467;
 villages, c. w. parts 467; cities
 sometimes called v. 467
 Village-cities 153
 Vine, offspring of the, Christ's blood
 (Origen) 394
 Vine-rows 296-301
 Vineyard, in Jabneh, the 290
 Vision, Heb., c. w. here 295; of a
 sheet, to Peter, the 452
 Voice, the living, Papias on 40;
 divine, a, cooing like a dove 478
 Vow, a, when to be relaxed 451

 Waiting, after sowing 41; at table
 277; s. *Diaconos*
 Walking, first instance of 468
 Wallet or scrip 150
 WAS, the 267
 Wash, and immerse 448; washing
 of hands, the 445 foll., the under-
 valuing of, punished by excom-
 munication 447
 Washing of the Feet, the, in Jn
 462
 Watch of the night, the fourth 418-
 21, 437; the third, and cock-
 crowing 419
 Water, and blood 157; and fire, as
 tests 423, 428

Way, the, of Christ, or of the Gospel 494-5

Weakness, physical or moral 186

Well, and fountain 406; the w. that followed Israel 334

West, the East and the 230

Wheat, the law of the grain of 10, 18, 20, 267, 309

"Whence [can]?", implying impossibility 269-74; thrice in LXX, once in Pentateuch 270

While, c. w. until 414; till (R.V.), an error for while 535

Whole, make 176; s. Heal, Save

Widow of Sarepta, the 409, 463

Wilderness, the, of Sinai 235; the, and a 235; s. Desert place, *Midbar*

Wind, or spirit, ambig. 424; a great w., three instances of 53

Wine, remember the Sabbath over the 294; new w. in Mk-Mt. om. by Lk. 294-5

Wiping off sins, symbolical, Origen on 443

Wisdom, not mentioned by Jn 119

Wisdom of Solomon, the, on love, *agapē* 234

Wise, the, are kings 253

Withdrawal, of Jesus 237

Within, s. Inside

Without (adv.), s. Outside

Without (prep.), without honour, or rejected, s. *Atimos*

Witness (n. fem.), *i.s.* testimony, twofold 156

Witness (n. masc.), *i.s.* one testifying, not in Jn 156; Lk.'s view of the

Apostles as witnesses 156; s. *Martus*

Witness (vb), *i.s.* testify, in Jn 156-7

Wonder, s. Marvelling

Word, Heb. *dābār* = also "thing" 203; in N.T. (A.V. and R.V.) interch. w. "saying" 22; in Jn as a whole 49; in Jn, how first mentioned by Jesus 21; of God or of the Gospel 19; sometimes ambig. 21; "the divine Word sleeps in the faithless" (Origen) 59; "the w. that I spake," in Jn, distinguished from "I" 512; s. also *Logos*

Works, the, that the Father hath given me 140

World, ambig. 90; a judgment of this w. 523; s. Ruler

Worship, true 406; worshipping Jesus, in Jn 401

Wounds, in Christ's hands, the 426

"Ye" emph. 255

Yetsar, Heb., *i.s.* nature, good or bad, in man 273

Yoke, Christ's 219, 228; y. and cross 507 foll.; y. of the precepts 508; Heb. break the y. = Targ. revolt from the Law 516

Young man (Heb. *na'ar*) or servant 233; "this y. m." in Zechariah 259; Joshua the son of Nun, a 291

Zarephath 409; s. Sarepta

INDEX

III. GREEK

[This Index includes mainly such Greek words as cannot be expressed by one English word, e.g. χόρτος, "grass," "hay," "fodder," and not such ordinary words as βασιλεύς, "king," unless there is something noteworthy in their idiomatic use.

"c.w." means "confused, or confusable, with."]

* Ἀβυσσος 36
ἀγαπᾶω 104; c.w. ἀπατᾶω 379
ἀγάπη 384; and φρόνησις 384; s. *Agape*
ἀγγεῖον 457-8
ἀγγελος 502, 518, 520; comp. 317
ἀγέλη 72, 92
ἀγιος 502, 518, 520
ἀγρίζω and καθαρίζω 463
ἀγρισμός 463
ἀγρός 463
ἀγοράζω 315, 272-4
ἀδυνατέω 139
ἀδύνατος 139
ἄθεος 476
αἰνίγμα 4-5
αἶρω, καθαίρω, and καθαίρω 460
ἀκοή 193
ἀκούω: imperat. 8; with accus. and with genit. 9; ἀκούσας inserted 218
ἀκριβώς 379
ἐλαος 469-70
ἀλειμμα 187
ἀλειπτής 183
ἀλείφω 175 foll., 183-4; d- and χρίω 175; s. *Aleiphein*
ἀλεκτοροφωνία 430
ἀληθής 23
ἀληθινός 21-6
ἀλίξω 221; ἀλίζομαι 378
ἀλλα ambig., "but" or "other" 60
Ἀλλαγμα 513
ἄλις: ἄλις 221

ἀναβιβάζω 56
ἀναβλέτω 328, 423, 425, 428
ἀνάγω 56
ἀνάπαυμα 220
ἀναπαύω 219 foll.
ἀναχωρέω and ὑποχωρέω 337
ἀνήρ 348; = Heb. *gader* 349; ἄνδρες and ἄνθρωποι 518-19
ἀνθρακιά 366
ἀνθρωπος and ἀνὴρ 518-19
ἀνίστημι: ἀνάστα 189; ἀνίστη and ἠγέρθη 190-91
ἀνοίγω 4
ἀντάλλαγμα 512 foll.
ἀξιώριον 162-4
ἀξιόδιον 162-4
ἀπαγγέλλω and διηγέομαι 81, 217
ἀπαρτέομαι and ἀρτέομαι 505
ἀπατάω: ἠπάτησεν c.w. ἠγάπησεν 379
ἀπέρχομαι and πορεύομαι 269, 273
ἀπλοία 61-2
ἀπό, with θεραπεύω 99; ambig. 236
ἀποθήκη 242
ἀπόλλυμι: ἵνα μὴ ἀπόληται 342
ἀπολύω and ἀποτάσσομαι 412-15
ἀπομαίνομαι 424; and διδάσκειν 220
ἀποπνίγω 76

ἀπορίω 199; and διαπορέω 192, 200; ἀπορηθεῖς 199
ἀπόρημα 199
ἀποσκευή 240
ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω 150
ἀπόστολοι 150
ἀποτάσσομαι and ἀπολύω 412-15; s. *Apostolos*
ἄττω, parall. to καίω and ἔρχομαι 82
ἀριθμός 351
ἀριστάω 222-3; ἀριστήσατε 222
ἀρκέω 270, 271
ἀρτόμαι 506-6
ἀρταγμός 253
ἀρπάζω 252-3
ἀρρωστέω 184
ἀρρωστία 176, 184
ἀρρωστος 184
ἀρτος 206; ἰσὺς οἶτος 229; s. *Bread, Loaves*
ἄρχομαι 155
ἄρχων 89
ἀσθενέω 175-6, 186; d- and προσκίπτω and σκάνδαλον 126
ἀσθενής 186
ἀσπάζομαι 416
ἀτιμάζω 134-5
ἀτιμοί 183 foll.; s. *Atimos*
ἀτιμώω 134-5
αἶψα 18
αἶριον 204
αὐτάρκεια 182
αὐτεξούσιον, τὸ 92

αὐτόματος 22-9

ἀφίστημι: ἀφίστανται
127, 139
ἄφωτος 459

Βαλλάντιον 170

βαπτίζω v.r. for βαπτίζω
446

βασανίζω 431-3; and
δοκιμάζω 422; a. Basa-
nizein

βάσκωνος ὀφθαλμός 459

βαστάζω and φέρω 341

βλαστάνω 37

βυθίζω 52

βωβός 470

Γεμίζω 342

γένηται 394

γίγνομαι: ἔγενθη am-
big. 252

γινώσκω: γινώσκεις 224

Δαιμόνιον δώματον 58,
431, 457

δακρύω 104

δαί 272

δαίπνεν 222

δαίπνον 222

δακτός 123, 125

δασμύνω 470

δαύτε 222

δάχομαι and λαμβάνω 2,
316-17

δα, a. δηνάριον

δηνάριον: δηναρίων c.w.

δη ἀνδρῶν 276

διά, διέκειν, and ὑπέρ 511

διαβλέπω 494, 496

διαδίδωμι ambig. 222;
"give in succession"

222; δ. and δίδωμι
and μερίζω 222

διαθήκη 225 foll.; a.
Diatheke

διακονέω, -ει 222, 277; a.
Diakonein, Diakonos

διακονοῦμαι 416

διαμερίζω 218, 220

διασκήνομαι 425

διανοίγω, metaph. and
lit. 226

διανοοῦμαι and προσκύνω
125

διατερέω and διέρχομαι
241

διαπορέω and ἀπορίω
192, 200

διαρρήσω and σχίζω 223

διασώζω 176

διαδάσσω 96

διαφθείρω 272

διδάσκω 220; διδάσκωμαι
and διποαίνομαι 220

διεραχμῶν 220

δίδωμι 202; pres. and
aor. imperat. 202-4;

δ. and διαδίδωμι and
μερίζω 222

διέρχομαι and διατερέω
241

διηγέομαι and ἀπαγγέλλω
21, 217

δοκίω 422

δοκιμάζω and πειράζω
225; and βασανίζω
422

δοῦλος 510; a. Donilos

δόταμι 129

δυνατός 129

δόσκαφος 470

δωρεά 227

Ε, i.e. Ε, c.w. C 276

εγείρω ambig. 176;
εγείρει 129; ἡγέρθη and
ἀρίστη 190-91

εγερφίας 21, 272

εἰ μή and μή 159

εἰμι: ἐστίν inserted for
emphasis 22

εἰρηνεύω 502

εἰρήνη 502

εἰς, "[amounting] to"
249

ἐκβάλλω, with ἔξω 522

ἐκλέγομαι 142

ἐκλύομαι, absol. 176

ἐκπλήσσομαι 112-14, 117

ἐκτός 455

ἐκφέρω c.w. ἐξάγω 422

ἐκφυγῶ 417

ελαύνω: ελαύνομαι am-
big. 424; and μαίνομαι
424

ἐλκίω and ἔλκω 424; and
προσλαμβάνω 422

ἔλκω 422-4

ἐμβλέπω 424-6

ἐμβριμάομαι 104, 472

ἐμπλήθω 206

ἐνεμι 457; τὰ ἐνόντα
455, 457

ἐνεκεν and ὑπό 511; ἔ.,
διά, and ὑπέρ 511

ἐνεθί 470

ἐνερπύω 21, 272

ἐνοπλος 161; ἐνοπλιον
c.w. ἐν ὄπλῳ 162

ἐντός 455

ἐνόντιον and ἐνόντιον 295

ἐνόντιον and ἐνόντιον 295

ἐνωρίζομαι 2

ἐξάγω c.w. ἐκφέρω 422

ἐξέρχομαι: ὁ ἐξελθὼν 177

ἐξεταίω 425

ἐξομολογέομαι 220

ἐξουθενῶ 125

ἔξω, with ἐξάγω 422;
with ἐκβάλλω 522;

ἐκεῖνοι ὁ ἔ. 14

ἔξωθεν 455

ἔπειτα 205; ἡ ἐπιοῦσα
204-5

ἐπερωτάω 12

ἐπί as prefix 205

ἐπιδημέω 252

ἐπιθυμέω 121

ἐπιθυμία 121-2

ἐπιχειροῦμαι 266

ἐπιδικαίω 258

ἐπιλόω 45-6

ἐπιοῦσα, ἡ 204

ἐπιοῦσι 202 foll.

ἐπισιτισμός 229

ἐπιστάτης 255

ἐπιστήμη 224

ἐπιτερεῖται 205

ἐπιτίρημα and ἐπιτερίω
429

ἐργάζομαι 208

ἐρέτω 245

ἐρημία 225

ἐρημις 225; ἐν [τῇ] ἐρημίᾳ
225

ἐρχομαι, parall. to κίω
and ἀπὼν 22

ἐρωτάω 11

ἐσθίω 259; and φαγεῖν
245; and τρώγειν 245;

a. Esthizein

ἐσθθεν 455

εὐκαιρέω 222 foll.

εὐκαιρον v.r. εἰς καιρόν
224

εὐκαιρῶς 222-4

εὐλογέω 220; εὐλογημένοι
219; ε. and εὐχαριστέω
215, 218

εὐλογητός 219

εὐνοια 50

εὐρίσκω 271

εὐχαριστέω 215, 218, 219

εὐχαριστία 219, 222, 222

ἐφήμερος 205

ἔως with indicative 225

Ζημιόω: τὸν τοῦν ζημιωθεῖς
514

ζῶν 162, 170

INDEX

Ἡμέρα, with κλίνει, κέ-
κλειεν etc. 261-2

Θαύμα and φάσμα, v.g.
for φάντασμα 431
θαυμάζω 143
θεραπεία ambig. 414
θεραπεύω and λάομαι 184,
256; θ. από 99; s.
Therapeutic

Ἰάομαι and θεραπεύω
184, 256; s. Iatric
ἴνα 79; ἴνα μή parall. to
ὅτι οὐ 6
Ἰουδαία ambig. 111
ἰσχύς: οὐκ ἰσχύει χεῖρ 99
ἰχθύδιον 230
ἰχθύς 228, 230, 235; and
ὀψάριον 228, 230

καθαίρω, καθαίρω, and
αἶρω 460
καθαίρω 460; and αἶρω 460
καθαρίζω 460; and ἀγνίζω
463
καθαρισμός 460-61
καθαρός 455
καιρός 234-5; eis καιρόν,
v.g. for εὐκαιρον 234;
s. εὐκαιρέω
καίω, parall. to ἀπτω
καίω, and ἔρχομαι 32
κακοπαθῆναι 175
κάλαθος 243
κάμνω 176
κάρταλλος 208, 242
κατὰ πενήτην 210
καταδυναστεύω 471-2
κατακλῆναι 221, 229
κατάκλις 212
κατακρήμνημι 117
κατακρημνίζω 115, 117
καταλείπω and ἀφήμι 254
καταμόνας 48, 238
κατανεύω 52, comp. 116
κατανοῶ 144
κατανύσσω 470
καταποντίζω 53
κατασιωπῶ 199
κατορύσσω 31
κείμεαι 266, 268-9, s. Laid
κλαίω 104
κλάσμα 237, 239, 264-5;
s. Clasma
κλῶν 222, 224, 229
κλίνει, with ἡμέρα 261-2
κλισία 297
κλυδωνίζω 423
κοιμάομαι 185

κοινός: κοιναῖς χερσίν
448; κ. βίος 449; κ.
οἶκος 449; s. Κοῖνος
κοινοφραγία 449
κοινός, diff. from μάλιν
412; v.g. for κοιναῖς
449
κοιναῖς, v.g. κοινός 449
κοινωνία 264
κόφινος 211, 226, 462; s.
Cophinos
κρεμάω 117
κρημνῶν 117
κυλλός 470
κυρτός 470
κῶμη 437; κῶμαι and
πόλεις 437; and μέρη
437
κωμόπολις 152, 437
κωφός 469-70
κωφός 470

Λαμβάνω and παραλαμ-
βάνω 57; and δέχομαι
3, 216-17
λατρεία 258
λεγιών, s. Legion
λιμήν, Hebraized 242
λόγος, s. Logos, Word
λοιπός 181
λυπέω 427, 429
λυγία 26
λύχνος 52

Μαίνομαι and ἐλαύνομαι
424
μαρτυρέω 156-7
μαρτυρία 156-7
μάρτυς 156-7
μεθύω, and πρσιά 298
μέλλω 274, 241
μένω: μένετε ambig. 187
μερίζω 228, 232
μέρος: μέρη 242, 437
μεταβαίνει 80
μή and ei μή 159
μαίνω, diff. from κοινός
412
μαροφαγέω, -ία 449
μικρόν (adv.) 42
μικρός 42, 255
μῆμα 69
μνημεῖον 69
μογιόλας 264, 467-70
μόδιος, Hebraized 34
μόνος 228; κατὰ μόναι 48
μορφή and σχῆμα 422
μυστήριον 15
Ναυαγέω 425

νήπιος 240
νήχομαι 425

Ζυλάριον 221

O, dropped in MS 24
οἶα 437
οἰσῖς 458
ὄμμα and ὀφθαλμός 485
ὀπίσω, s. Behind
ὄπλον 162, 165
ὄρφαρία 255
ὄσπρια 45
ὅτι οὐ, parall. to ἵνα μή 6
οὐσία, Hebraized 205
οὗτος resumptive 191
ὀφθαλμός βάσκανος 459;
δ. and ὄμμα 485
ὀφρύς 115
ὄχλος and πῦθος 80
ὀψάριον 228; for ἰχθύς
228, 230
ὀψία 261

Παῖδάριον 226 foll.; s.
Païdation
παιδεύω 241
παῖδιον 228
παιτοκράτωρ 129
παραβολή 4-5, 10-12
παρακαλέω 71, 78-9
παράκλησις 78
παρακλητός, s. Paracletis
παρακολουθῆναι 16
παραλαμβάνω 55-6; and
λαμβάνω 55, 57
παρατίθημι 228-9, 232
παρηγορέω 78
παροιμία 4, 12
πάσσαλος 163
πατάσσω 499
πατρίς 109-10
πειράζω and δοκιμάζω 225
πειρῆ v.g. πειρά 245
πεμπταῖς 212
πέμπτος: πέμπτη γενεά
212
πέμπτω and ἀποστελλῶ 150
περάγω 152
περιοῖσις 205
περιπατέω 423
περυσσία 228
περίσσευμα 227, 229
περυσσεύω 227, 229
περικτρεῖω 242
περιφέρω 16
πηγή 25, 461
πήρα 170
πῆρος 470
πίπτω 178

πλεονεξία 133
 πληγή 100
 πληθός and ὄχλοι 80
 πληθύνω 355
 πλήρωμα 339, 342
 πλοῦσιον 60
 πλοῖον 60
 πνύμα 9, 53, 100, 424
 πνίγω 76
 ποιμαίνω 267-8
 πόλις and κώμη 427
 πολίς: πολλά 236, with
 verbs of speech 199;
 ὥρα πολλή 261
 πορεύομαι and ἀνέρχομαι
 269, 273
 ποτίζω 299
 πραγματεία, Hebraized
 123
 πράσις, s. πρασιό
 πρασιό 296-301; with
 μέθω 298; with ποτίζω
 299; πρασιαί πρασιαί
 296 foll.
 πρασιόομαι 298
 πρόβλημα 4
 προέρχομαι with accus.
 236, 238
 προκόπτω 425
 προσέχω 8
 προσκεφάλαιον 62-3
 πρόσκομμα 126
 προσκόπτω 126, 133; τ.
 and διανοομαι 125;
 τ. and ἀσθενής and
 σκάνδαλον 126
 προσκυνέω 461
 προσκύνημα 279
 προσλαμβάνω and ἐλκύνω
 433
 προσποιέω 144
 προσορμίζω 244, 443, 474
 πυγμή 443
 πυρών 441
 τώρως 306, 441; s.
 Ρῶνσις
 Ῥάβδος 180
 ραπτίζω and βαπτίζω 448
 Σ, i. s. C, c. w. C 276
 σάνδαλον 187-8
 σάτα τρία 273
 Σιδών 463
 σίτοις c. w. ἄρτοις 239
 σκανδαλίζω 124 foll.
 σκάνδαλον 126, 130, 501
 σκανδαλόν 501
 σκεῦος 24
 σπλάγχθισμαι 247, 252

σπλάγχθον 249 foll.;
 σπλάγχθα 247 foll.
 στατήρ 280
 στεναγμός 473
 στένω, στενάζω etc. 473
 στοιχεῖα 287
 στοῖχοι 310; κατὰ στοῖχον
 313
 συμπόσιον 296 foll.; συμ-
 πόσια συμπόσια *ibid.*
 σύμπραξις 137
 συνάγω: συνάγομαι and
 ὑποστρέφω 218
 συναλλίζομαι 221
 συνέχω 470
 συνθήκη 336
 συνίημι: συνήκω render-
 ed as pluperf. 423
 συντρίβω 223
 σφραγίς 267
 σφυρί 211, 226, 423; s.
 Sphurides
 σχῆμα and μορφή 422
 σχίζω and διαρήσσω 323
 σχίσμα 113
 σώζω 176
 σῶμα 86
 Τάγμα 310
 τάλειθα 98
 τάξις 313
 τακμήριον 426
 τεκνίον 42
 τέκνον 42
 τέκτων 120 foll.
 τελευτάω 177
 τέλει 265
 τηλαυγής 424-5
 τηλαυγής 424
 τίθημι: θέθε ὑμῶν 206-9
 τίς 217
 τράχημα 246
 τρανός 469
 τράπεζα 247
 τροφαί 274
 τρώγω 245-7; s. Τρώγειν
 Τλη 50
 ὑμεῖς, ὑμεῖς, emph. 9, 356
 ὑπέρ, διά, and ἐνεκεν 511
 ὑπέρσιον 62
 ὑπό and ἐνεκεν 511
 ὑποδόν: ὑποδεξιμένος 167
 ὑποστρέφω and συνάγομαι
 218
 ὑποχωρῶ and ἀναχωρῶ
 227
 Φαγεῖν 245, 247; s.
 Phagein

φαίνω: ἐφάνη 191
 φάντασμα 53, 429, 431
 foll.; with v. r. φάσμα
 and θαῦμα 431; s.
 Phantasma
 φάσμα, s. φάντασμα
 φέρω and βαστάζω 241;
 ἐφέροντο (Orig.) 256
 φθορεῖς 123
 φιλάω 230
 φίλος 104: ἐαυτὸν φιλεῖν
 280
 φίλημα 279-82; diff.
 from φιλία 281; φ.
 ἁγίων 278; φ. ἀγαπῆς
 278
 φίλια 50, 281
 φίλοι 104, 282
 Φοίνισσα v. r. Χαναάνα
 466
 φρέαρ 25
 φρόνησις 284
 φυλακή and ὥρα 419
 φύραμα 272
 φωτὴ γῶσα 49
 φῶς 23
 Χαίρω 168
 χαλεπός 74
 χαλκεύς 121
 χαλκοῦς 173
 Χανααν v. r. for Φοίνισσα
 466
 χεῖρ, s. ἰσχύω
 χλωρός 204-6; χ. χόρτος
 202
 χορτάζω 204-7, 260,
 comp. 236; s. Chori-
 dazein
 χόρτοις 27, 202-6; χ.
 χλωρός 202; χ. ὕμνος
 205; ὁ χ. τοῦ ἀγροῦ
 and ἐν ἀγρῷ ὁ χ. 202;
 s. Chorios
 χρίσμα 187
 χριστός and ἀλημιμένος
 496
 χρίω 175
 χυλός 470
 χῶμα γῆς 72
 χώρα 86 foll.; s. Me-
 dinaah
 χωρῶ 444
 Ψυχίον 327
 ψυχὴ 514
 Ὀμοφαγία 299
 ὥρα and φυλακή 419; ὥ.
 πολλή 261

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

PUBLISHED BY ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.

CLUE: A Guide through Greek to Hebrew
Scripture (Diatessarica—Part I).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net.

THE CORRECTIONS OF MARK (Diatessarica—Part II).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 15s. net.

FROM LETTER TO SPIRIT (Diatessarica—Part III)

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 20s. net.

PARADOSIS (Diatessarica—Part IV).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net.

JOHANNINE VOCABULARY (Diatessarica—Part V).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 13s. 6d. net.

JOHANNINE GRAMMAR (Diatessarica—Part VI).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 16s. 6d. net.

SILANUS THE CHRISTIAN.

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net.

APOLOGIA: An Explanation and Defence.

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 2s. 6d. net.

NOTES ON NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM
(Diatessarica—Part VII).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

PUBLISHED BY ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.

INDICES TO DIATESSARICA.

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 2s. 6d. net.

THE MESSAGE OF THE SON OF MAN.

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 4s. 6d. net.

PUBLISHED BY THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

THE SON OF MAN (Diatessarica—Part VIII).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 16s. 6d. net.

LIGHT ON THE GOSPEL FROM AN ANCIENT POET

(Diatessarica—Part IX).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 12s. 6d. net.

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL, INTRODUCTION

(Diatessarica—Part X, Section I).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 2s. 6d. net.

MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA (I).

Demy 8vo, Wrapped, Price 2s. net.

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL, THE BEGINNING

(Diatessarica—Part X, Section II).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 12s. 6d. net.

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL, THE PROCLAMATION
OF THE NEW KINGDOM

(Diatessarica—Part X, Section III).

Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 12s. 6d. net.

MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA (II).

Demy 8vo, Wrapped, Price 3s. net.

Cambridge:

**PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS**

CPSIA information can be obtained at www.ICGtesting.com
Printed in the USA
LVOW12*1448160714

394633LV00005B/96/P



9 781167 144189



KESSINGER PUBLISHING®, LLC
WWW.KESSINGER.NET